Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-235 *3 December 1987*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

NOVOSTI's Falin on Chance for Disarmament *[Vienna DIE PRESSE 5-6 Dec]* 1
Surikov Discusses Measures To Counter SDI *[Vienna VOLKSSTIMME 6 Dec]* 1
'Groundless' Charge Over Radar Facility Hit *[PRAVDA 6 Dec]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gremitskikh Holds Briefing at Press Center 4
Details Gorbachev's U.S. Agenda 4
Views Gorbachev-Thatcher Talks 4
Notes Public's View of Summit 4
Africa Fund to Get $100 Million 5
Arms Progress Will Ease Entry, Exit Cases *[Kuvshinnikov in IZVESTIYA 5 Dec]* 5
PRAVDA Views Summit Prospects, Hawke's Visit *[N. Kurdyumov, 6 Dec]* 5
International Situation—Questions & Answers *[S. Pravdin, S. A. Losev]* 8
USSR Insists RSA Troops Withdraw From Angola 10
NATO Bodies Discuss INF Treaty, Arms Issues *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 11
PRAVDA On Results of Meetings *[Kharlanov, 4 Dec]* 11
Warsaw Pact-NATO Arms Talks Session Held 12
USSR Joins Airline Crimes Convention 12

REAGAN-GORBACHEV SUMMIT

Gorbachev Arrives, 'Improvement' Sought *[PRAVDA 8 Dec]* 13
Reagan on 'Easing Tensions', 'Goodwill' 13
U.S. Officials Discuss, Comment on Relations 14
Shultz: 'More Stable' Ties *[PRAVDA 6 Dec]* 14
Shultz NBC Interview Noted 14
Carlucci Supports Treaty 14
Schedule for News Briefings Announced 14
Gerasimov-Fitzwater Briefing 15
Soviet Officials, Commentators on Summit 15
Gerasimov BBC Interview 15
Gerasimov Interviewed *[Tel Aviv IDF Radio]* 16
Ovchinnikov Comments *[PRAVDA 7 Dec]* 17
Kobysh: Anti-Soviet 'Campaign' *[IZVESTIYA 6 Dec]* 18
Golts Ponders Summit Prospects *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Dec]* 19
Bogachev: Treaty 'Major Victory' 21
Borin on Attempts To 'Poison' *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Dec]* 22
Zhurkin: 'Optimistic' *[Tokyo NHK Television]* 23
Zagladin, Falin on Expectations *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 3 Dec]* 23
Petrovskiy Interviewed *[Athens RIZOSPASTIS 4 Dec]* 25
Arms Curb Examined *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Dec]* 26
PRAVDA on Atmosphere *[6 Dec]* 27
PRAVDA: 'Great Expectations' *[7 Dec]* 28
'Asymmetry' Seen in Attitudes *[IZVESTIYA 6 Dec]* 29
Further Reportage on Events, Activities 31
More on 6 Dec News Conference 31
PRAVDA on Moscow Peace 'Rally' *[6 Dec]* 33
Moscow Demonstrators 'Wretched' 33
Clergyman U.S. Arrival Blocked 34
Religious Leaders Cited *[IZVESTIYA 6 Dec]* 34
Opinion Poll Analyzed *[IZVESTIYA 4 Dec]* 34

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

1988 U.S. Defense Budget Compromise Analyzed 37
Jewish Group Rejects Congress Interference *[IZVESTIYA 3 Dec]* 37

China

Korolev Comments on Hun-Sen-Sihanouk Meeting 38
USSR, PRC Sign Sci-Tech Protocol 4 Dec 38
USSR To Supply Generating Units 38
Daily Concludes Series on PRC Economic Reform *[Y. Kornilov in SELSKAYA ZHIN 2 Dec]* 39

Northeast Asia

Reportage, Comment on Upcoming ROK Elections 40
'Fierce Character' Noted 40
Church Groups To Observe 40
Tikhomirov Views Campaign *[PRAVDA 26 Nov]* 40
Viktorov Comments on U.S. Report on ROK 41
Joint DPRK Textile Complex Anniversary Noted 42

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Ryzhkov Meets With PRK's Hun Sen 7 Dec *[PRAVDA 8 Dec]* 42
More on Hun Sen-Sihanouk Talks in Paris 43
'Closed-Door Meeting' Held *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 43
Hun Sen on Results 43
Fedayev Assesses Meeting *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 44

Near East & South Asia

Mubarak Receives Cable From Soviet Leaders *[MENA]* 44
Egyptian Foreign Minister on Summit, Ties *[TRUD 6 Dec]* 45
USSR, PDRY Foreign Ministries Exchange Cables 45
Moscow Meeting Marks Afghan Treaty Jubilee *[PRAVDA 4 Dec]* 45
Afghan Envoy Adresses Meeting 46
Bangladesh President Dissolves Parliament 46

Sub-Saharan Africa

USSR-Angola Amity Society Holds Conference *[IZVESTIYA 2 Dec]* 46
USSR Delegate Addresses Arusha Conference *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 47
Further on CPSU Delegation's Visit to Rwanda 47
Received by Habymana *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 47
Returns to Moscow 5 Dec *[PRAVDA 6 Dec]* 47
Belyakov, CPSU Delegation Depart for Mali *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 47

East Europe

Stoph Meets Mikulic in Berlin; Summit Noted 48
Joint Ventures With Bloc Firms Described *[PRAVDA 2 Dec]* 48
Romania's Brasov Truck Plant Difficulties 48
Leadership 'Sharply' Criticized *[TRUD 5 Dec]* 48
Directors Relieved of Duties *[PRAVDA 8 Dec]* 48

West Europe

Further on Gorbachev-Thatcher Meeting in UK 49
Arrival Shown on Moscow TV 49

TASS Report on Talks 49
Press Statements Reported *[PRAVDA 8 Dec]* 51
Thatcher: 'Very Good Atmosphere' 51
Gorbachev Departs Britain 52
Shevardnadze, Howe Hold 'Constructive' Meeting 52
Prospects for Soviet, British Relations Viewed 52
Further on Ligachev's Activities in France 53
'Numerous Meetings' Held *[PRAVDA 6 Dec]* 53
Paris News Conference Held *[PRAVDA 6 Dec]* 53
More on Paris News Conference *[LE MONDE 6-7 Dec]* 54
Departs Paris for Moscow 6 Dec *[PRAVDA 7 Dec]* 55
More on French Communist Party Congress 55
Marchais Delivers Report 2 Dec *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 55
Work of Congress Completed *[PRAVDA 7 Dec]* 61

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Solomentsev Speaks to Chelyabinsk Voters *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 63
Medvedev Dnepropetrovsk Activities Noted *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 66
Vorotnikov Inspects Tambov Facilities 67
Demichev, Others Mark Law Courts Anniversary 67
Dolgikh Speaks at Shipping Conference 67
Razumovskiy Activities in Lithuania Noted *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 67
Astrauskas Elected Lithuanian Supsov President 68
Komsomol CC Begins Meeting in Moscow 68
'Underground Trade Unionist' Released *[DPA]* 68
Historians To Write Study on World War II 68
Importance of People's Historical Memory *[PRAVDA 3 Dec]* 68
Work of Visa Office, Refusal Reasons Viewed *[TRUD]* 71

Economic

Operation of State Enterprise Law Explained *[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 27 Nov]* . 73
Bank President on Approaches to Reform 75
Economist Considers Food Price Rises *[IZVESTIYA 3 Dec]* 75
Proposed Farm, Food Price Changes to Aid Output *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 2 Dec]* 78
Moscow Cooperatives To Have Guiding Council *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 28 Nov]* 80
Economic Seminar on Change to New Conditions *[IZVESTIYA 3 Dec]* 80
Major Environmental Violations Uncovered *[IZVESTIYA 26 Nov]* 81

Scientific

Gorbachev Signs Obituary of Scientist Zeldovich *[PRAVDA 5 Dec]* 82
Correction to Cosmos-1899 Satellite Launch 83
Briefs 83
'Microbioprom-87' Closes 83
Antarctic Expedition Supplied 83

Military

'Military Bulletin' Numbers Missiles 83
Lizichev Addresses Session on Komsomol Work *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 6 Dec]* 83
Kurkotkin Speaks at Bagramyan Memorial Soiree *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 4 Dec]* 83
Lushev Addresses Army Sports Specialists *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 29 Nov]* 84
Kazakov on Need to Revamp MVD Image 84

NOVOSTI's Falin on Chance for Disarmament

AU071238 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 5-6 Dec 87 p 2

[Article by Valentin Falin, head of the Soviet NOVOSTI press agency: "Historic Chance for Disarmament"]

[Text] The results of the Washington meeting can be of utmost importance for subsequent development if both sides adhere to goals already agreed to in Geneva and Reykjavik, that is, halting the arms race on earth and preventing the militarization of space, if they thus aim at making nuclear war and any other war on earth impossible. If this goal does not remain just a statement but is integrated into both sides' practical policy, the future of civilization will become much easier than we imagine today.

We are experiencing a moment probably unprecedented in the system of East-West relations. The yardstick of the agreements and quality of the solutions, in particular with regard to verifying and eliminating individual arms systems, depends nine-tenths on the United States. We are willing to go much further than the United States in all these issues. We are willing to have any agreement linked to the strictest system of verification.

The current negotiations with the United States, which have facilitated the text of the treaty on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles, have shown that the most complicated and comprehensive problems can be solved with goodwill on both sides.

If the INF treaty is signed, a new situation will develop. This treaty solves practically the same questions of verification that should be integrated into any other agreement on nuclear and conventional armament.

Thus, it is to be hoped that the drafting of a constructive position on the "conventional" weapons of the United States and NATO will also be accelerated in Washington.

Furthermore, stimuli for an agreement on banning and eliminating chemical weapons are also expected. The negotiations will also deal with prohibition of testing nuclear facilities for military purposes.

In our view, there are many additional, interesting projects for establishment of nuclear-free zones in northern Europe, in the Balkans, and in other parts of the world. We do not understand why the West, in such a derogatory and arrogant way, neglects the interests of the people concerned with freeing themselves from the burden of the danger of nuclear war.

In any case, the historic chance for all these fields is here. In the very near future, we will learn whether the U.S. Administration is willing to orient its policy to a greater extent toward common sense and not toward military strength and violence.

Surikov Discusses Measures To Counter SDI

AU071447 Vienna VOLKSSTIMME in German 6 Dec 87 p 3

[Unattributed interview with USSR Air Force Major General Boris Surikov, "Soviet Government expert on new kinds and systems of weapons of mass destruction"; date and place not given]

[Text] The Soviet side has repeatedly stated that it will find a response to SDI which will be 10 times, even 100 times, cheaper than the U.S. Star Wars program. In his latest interview for NBC, Mikhail Gorbachev again pointed this out. Air Force Maj Gen Boris Surikov, Soviet Government expert on new kinds and systems of weapons of mass destruction, revealed in an interview how the USSR will make Reagan's SDI ineffective.

Question: The West asserts that the USSR has been working on its own SDI program for a long time.

Surikov: We are not working on SDI. The USSR has no project for a national antimissile system. When we held the SALT I negotiations, we already knew that not only traditional antiballistic missiles but also means based on new physical principles can be used for defense against missiles. At that time, the USSR and U.S. delegations agreed that such work can be permitted, but only on stationary, ground-based objects within the framework of the agreed antimissile test sites. Furthermore, the treaty allows the modernization of existing, permitted antimissile means—of course, within the limits of the valid restrictions. Therefore, from time to time we replace outdated, obsolete antiballistic missiles with new ones, within the agreed territory of the capital's antimissile systems. But nothing more. Potential Countermeasures [subhead]

Question: The USSR is preparing an asymmetric response to SDI. I know that no details will be revealed about this. But could you explain, as far as possible, what this response might be like?

Surikov: We are not in favor of power games with the United States. But neither do we want to watch the clouds gather above our heads indifferently. These are some examples of potential countermeasures against space-based weapons, which are to make it impossible for the United States to pursue a nuclear war with impunity: The first and simplest measure is increasing the strategic attack potential in line with the increasing danger. There is the possibility of developing cheap decoy missiles without warheads, which, when launched in great numbers together with ICBM's for a counterattack, will highly overstrain the first and also the following barrages of the U.S. space-based antimissile system. It is also possible to concentrate our missiles in limited areas, which would require at least three times as many U.S. combat platforms in space. It is also possible to protect the missiles against laser beams in quite a simple way: by providing them with a reflective coating, by

making the missile body spin, equipping it with a cooling system, and so on. One can also accelerate deployment of weapons that cannot be intercepted. Cruise missiles, for instance, cannot be destroyed from space, because they are protected by the atmosphere. This possibly requires mass production of these missiles. The Soviet Union is also capable of keeping the United States from succumbing to the temptation to make a disarming first strike. An anti-antimissile system can be established much more quickly than a national antimissile system.

Question: Is it possible to develop something against space-based combat platforms?

Surikov: Certainly. One can put them out of service with small antisatellites [antisatelliten], which are equipped with additional protection against lasers and with homing heads—or also with cheap space mines which are sent into orbit. It is possible to produce dense clouds of heavy or light obstacles in the trajectory of the combat and information platforms, for instance, obstacles consisting of metal balls or swarf, sand, and so on. The measures will be combined. For every poison, there will be a an antidote.

Question: Have your experts considered all the possible SDI varieties? Could the Pentagon not surprise them when realizing the project? Billions of Dollars for SDI [subhead]

Surikov: Miracles do not happen, and they never do in the field of military technology. Every innovation first has to be developed in the laboratory, then designed, and tested. Now, for instance, they are preparing to check the potential possibilities of the so-called accelerator weapon, which is based on the use of high-energy particles accelerated to very high speeds.

At first, they planned to destroy our missiles with this weapon during the stage of their active flight. Then it was realized that this weapon is ineffective below a height of 200 km. The atmosphere interferes. Thus, they have given up this idea and decided to test accelerators for the identification of decoys among real targets. They plan to launch a payload of about 20 tonnes into space: an accelerator, a targeting satellite, and a detector satellite. Then they plan to aim this package at the target from a distance of several kilometers. They want to see what happens. But what happens if a missile or a warhead is at a distance of many thousands of kilometers? Just let them waste their money on these experiments!

Question: The United States intends to use $1.5-2 billion for SDI. What will be the price of the asymmetric response?

Surikov: Our experts have calculated that it will be one-tenth of the above-mentioned sum, at the most. In our country, there is no military-industrial complex; no one is interested in raising the expenditures. Everything will depend on which systems they decide to use. It is possible that our expenditures will be even less. We will try to select the optimum variety of countermeasures that is sufficient for security and does not require any excessive allotment from the country's budget.

'Groundless' Charge Over Radar Facility Hit

PM071455 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Second Edition p 6

[Article by TASS special correspondents V. Itkin and L. Chernenko, especially written for PRAVDA: "And the Trailer Is Empty.... So What 'Worries' People in the United States?"]

[Text] The green trailer [furgon] stood on a massive turntable base. We climbed the few steps and opened the iron door. The loud echo of emptiness met us: nothing but bare walls and empty compartments inside.

It was not idle curiosity that brought us here. We wanted to see for ourselves what it was that the United States considered evidence of Soviet violation of the ABM Treaty.

So why is it that Americans are worried about "witches' houses," such as the one we saw for ourselves, and which are now permanently resident near Moscow and Gomel?

Let us go back in time to 1984. At that time the U.S. side raised the question of mobile radar stations at the test site near Sary-Shagan. The Soviet Union gave attention to this concern. It was explained to the Americans that stations like that were not ABM defense radar stations but had been used at the Sary-Shagan test site since the early seventies as instrumentation and measurement facilities. But, in order to avoid any complaints whatsoever, our side decided to eliminate these stations. One of them was destroyed on site, and the other two were dismantled. The equipment from these two was also dismantled and destroyed, while the actual trailers were transported to the Moscow and Gomel regions and handed over to the national economy.

The trailer now standing at a Moscow enterprise site traveled a long way to get there. First it went by rail, and then on a powerful "Kraz" tractor unit.

"We were extremely lucky to get hold of this trailer," Yu. Belov, chief engineer at the enterprise which manufactures civil aviation equipment used for air traffic control purposes, told us. "The trailer is valuable to us because it is fitted with a rotational orientation device and is equipped with gears and accurate rotation measuring instruments. This means that it can be used as a base for creating an antenna measurement installation. This will help us save the funds that would have been spent on erecting a permanent installation, while its use will give us additional opportunities to produce better antenna devices for radar stations designed for air traffic control

in civil aviation, where the precision of antenna functions is exceptionally important. It would be wasteful to throw such a trailer away, because its rotational device is not an item in series production."

The trailer is still empty, but work is already in progress to prepare the measurement equipment that will be installed inside it. A large dish antenna is being prepared for installation on it. This complex will be controlled from special premises, which will be fitted with measuring equipment and automatic recorders accurately recording the antenna's rotation and measuring signal strength.

"Similar installations for antenna measurements do exist within the national economy," Yu. Belov went on. "As a rule, however, these are permanent installations demanding large capital expenditure. We, on the other hand, having acquired the trailer, will be able to achieve this at a considerably lower cost. After all, it is fitted with gears making it possible to rotate the cab and data recorders capable of accurately fixing its bearings. This is what will make it possible to make efficient use of it for antenna measurements."

Ensuring flight safety in civil aviation largely depends on the quality of radar station antennas. This is why every antenna unit is manufactured with special thoroughness. Its parameters are measured with great accuracy, and all the information is entered in a special log. Such measurement work will be done by the installation to be set up on the base of the empty trailer brought here from the Sary-Shagan test site. This is an exclusively peaceful task. Its successful solution, with the help of equipment previously used for military purposes, proves yet again that the fruits of disarmament could bring tangible benefits to the national economy.

The steps toward disarmament, which the whole world expects from the forthcoming summit meeting in Washington, could place vast resources and a colossal scientific and technical potential at the service of people. The trailer whose route was so closely tracked by U.S. satellites from space is actually on this peaceful path. It is important that this path also contains avenues along which scientists and specialists from Leningrad, in cooperation with Americans, elaborated and tested a microwave landing system for civil aviation. It will make it possible to guide aircraft on landing not just along a single set path but on any trajectory. The fitting of this system will be mandatory for airports and passenger airliners from 1995.

In the process of developing this system, U.S. and Soviet specialists exchanged information and repeatedly met at symposiums. Our on-board landing equipment was tested in Atlantic City in the United States, while Soviet airports tested U.S. equipment. By means of such joint efforts, we could ensure not only the safety of airline passengers but also the safety of the entire planet and all people.

The trailer, which we inspected and really did find empty, will be shown, as previously announced, to U.S. representatives also. This is yet another step in trust and openness. How many similar steps have already been taken in this direction—the trip by foreign correspondents to the Soviet nuclear test site last year, the visit by foreign experts to the military installation in Shikhany, the tour by U.S. congressmen at the radar station near Krasnoyarsk! All these are expressions of new thinking, of consistent affirmation of openness in a sphere where it could not even have been imagined previously.

This is why we expect constructive steps in response rather than new groundless accusations by the U.S. side.

Gremitskikh Holds Briefing at Press Center

Details Gorbachev's U.S. Agenda

LD071940 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] A briefing on the current problems of the world policy was held in the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow today. Yuriy Aleksandrovich Gremitskikh, first deputy head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, briefed Soviet and foreign journalists on the official visit by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, to the United States. He said, in particular:

[Begin Gremitskikh recording] We view this meeting as one of the most important events because at it a treaty on the liquidation of Soviet and U.S. medium- and shorter-range missiles will be signed. For the first time, a realistic step on the path of real disarmament, that is on the path toward a nuclear-free world will be made. We expect, I am convinced, that many other questions, including the reduction of strategic offensive weapons with strict observation of the ABM Treaty, the just settlement of regional conflicts, and questions of bilateral relations also will be examined at the meeting.

Concerning the stay of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev in the United States, I can report the following:

He will arrive at 0040 Moscow time on 8 December; it will be 1640 in Washington. The arrival will be at Andrews Air Force Base. Then comes the arrival at the residence, and there will be a short meeting with Secretary of State George Shultz.

On 8 December, there will be a welcoming ceremony in the White House. Short speeches by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan are envisaged. There will be talks with President Reagan in the Oval Office. Then there will be lunch in the Soviet private residence and there will be a signing ceremony for the treaty on the liquidation on medium- and shorter-range nuclear missiles. Addresses by leaders of the two powers to the U.S. and Soviet people are envisaged. After the signing of the treaty a further meeting is planned on the same day with President Reagan.

Then, on 9 December there will be meetings at the USSR Embassy with representatives of U.S. scientific circles and intelligentsia. There will be an official dinner in the White House. [end recording]

Views Gorbachev-Thatcher Talks

LD081326 Moscow TASS in English 1324 GMT 8 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev, during his Monday's meeting with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, stressed the importance of the Soviet-American agreement on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles.

Both sides emphasized that the agreement was a result not only of the efforts by the Soviet Union and the United States, but also of their actions being in consent and carried out jointly with their allies, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman said today.

Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy head of the Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, was addressing Soviet and foreign journalists at a briefing in Moscow.

Gorbachev stressed the role of Europe in world politics, Gremitskikh observed. Europe's role, the Soviet leader said, was not only indispensable, but it also had to grow. No major problems could be resolved without Europe.

Thatcher said, on her part, that she and other Western European leaders backed by 100 percent the signing of the INF treaty. The prime minister wished success to the forthcoming summit between Gorbachev and U.S. President Ronald Reagan.

The two leaders paid much attention during their conversation to problems of reaching an agreement on reducing by 50 percent strategic offensive arms of the United States and the Soviet Union, strengthening the ABM Treaty, banning chemical weapons and destroying their stockpiles, and some other issues.

Thatcher described the forthcoming conclusion of the INF treaty as an historic event for peoples of the entire world, said the Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman.

Notes Public's View of Summit

LD081413 Moscow TASS in English 1358 GMT 8 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 8 TASS—"A comparison of public opinion polls in the United States and the USSR shows that a clear majority of both Soviet people and Americans want the abolition of the danger of nuclear war, stand for Soviet-American accords on nuclear and other disarmament, for an improvement of Soviet-American relations and a reduction of tension in the world", said Yuriy Gremitskikh, first deputy head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

He told a briefing here today that a rather thorough poll was conducted recently in the United States by the newspaper WASHINGTON POST and the ABC television company on the main topics and issues that should be discussed at the Soviet-American summit that is beginning in Washington today.

Together with the pollsters one must admit that large sections of Americans are not well informed about these topics and issues. "But this is not the main thing. Those who turned out to be more or less informed said that they regard the lessening of the danger of nuclear war as the main subject for the Soviet-American talks. Almost a half of those polled also consider it necessary to improve

relations between the United States and the USSR and believe in the possibility of such an improvement. Three out of five said they were confident the Soviet-American summit will help reduce international tension", Gremitskikh said.

We have already reported on the results of such a poll in the Soviet capital", Yuriy Gremitskikh said. "I would like to hope that the sentiments of both peoples will find their worthy reflection in the results of the meeting between the leaders of the USSR and the United States".

Africa Fund to Get $100 Million

LD071512 Moscow TASS in English 1432 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS—The Soviet Union's donation to the Africa (Action for Resisting Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid) fund will amount to some 65 million roubles (100 million dollars, by the current official exchange rate), Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told newsmen today.

Gremitskikh, first deputy chief of the ministry's information directorate, was answering a query from a British correspondent at a briefing for Soviet and Foreign reporters here.

The fund has been instituted within the framework of the Non-Aligned Movement in keeping with a decision of the Harare forum.

The money, Gremitskikh explained, will be spent on the construction of three vocational training schools and the dispatch of up to 50 Soviet vocational training instructors and lecturers to work there for three years as well as on the dispatch of other Soviet specialists, including physicians, teachers and technical experts, to "Frontline" nations for up to two years.

Besides, this year a total of five million roubles worth of various goods will be sent to Mozambique as a gift from the Soviet Union.

Arms Progress Will Ease Entry, Exit Cases

PM071155 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent A. Kuvshinnikov report from USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center: "The Voice of Responsibility"]

[Text] A public commission for international cooperation in the sphere of humanitarian questions and human rights has been set up within the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation.

Among the basic areas of the commission's activity, its deputy chairman, V. Yakovlev, director of the All-Union Science and Research Institute of Soviet Law, told the Moscow press conference, are, above all, the preparation and dissemination abroad of information material on the position in the humanitarian sphere, and on the safeguarding of citizens' rights and freedoms in Soviet society.

To be honest, added A. Adamovich, member of the commission and writer, I would not have agreed to be a member of such a commision if its task were to be, as before, basically answering recriminations and accusations. That is not to my liking. Here the aim is different—to achieve mutual understanding and get to know one another.

In the restructuring era everything is geared to solving the problems of the past, including in the sphere of human rights. Yet there are people who act in line with the old traditions, not accepting or understanding the new trends and hindering our progress along the path of democratization. Our commission's remit is to counter these conservative forces, A. Adamovich observed.

Replying to journalists' questions, participants in the press conference provided a fundamental evaluation of the anti-Soviet campaign launched, in particular, by U.S. Zionist circles on the eve of the Soviet-American summit meeting.

"How do you regard the refusal of exit visas on the grounds of knowledge of state secrets?" a REUTER correspondent asked.

The main attempts to maintain these secrets, B. Krylov observed in reply, are being made by the West, that is to say, the ban on the transfer of technology and the operation of COCOM. Abolish them and the notion of secret will be simplified.

It was stressed at the the press conference that progress toward accords on disarmament questions and toward reducing the danger of war for one another will undoubtedly ease the solution of questions concerning exit, entry, and all manner of exchanges.

PRAVDA Views Summit Prospects, Hawke's Visit

PM071215 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[Nikolay Kurdyumov "International Review"]

[Text] Before an Important Stage [subhead]

It is no longer days but a matter of hours before the start of the Washington Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, and the world is literally living in anticipation of this most important international event. The tremendous significance attached by the world public to the visit by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the upcoming talks with U.S. President R. Reagan is evidenced by the fact that long before the start of the meeting it became the main foreign policy topic in

all the world's press and the other mass media, and that around 6,000 journalists from every part of the world have descended on the American capital to cover it. A graphic expression of this is the widespread interest not only in the United States but throughout the world to the Soviet leader's interview with the American television company NBC, which once again convincingly demonstrated the USSR's unwavering attachment to the cause of peace.

The universal attention being devoted to the upcoming summit meeting is natural and justified. It will be taking place in a situation when the world has approached a turning point, when the question of where mankind will go next is being decided—will mankind proceed to a further and increasingly dangerous arms race, or will it find the strength to make a turnabout toward real disarmament and the elimination of the threat of a nuclear catastrophe. The aspirations and wishes of all honest and sensible people on earth are the same. The ideas of the salvation of life and civilization, a nuclear-free world, and peaceful coexistence and equal international cooperation are in keeping with the cherished desires and aspirations of all peoples. They expect that their hopes of a change for the better in the situation will find concrete reflection in the policy of the two great powers and greet every piece of good news with enthusiasm.

An indicative detail is that mankind everywhere has already begun to sigh with relief although the Soviet-U.S. treaty on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles has still to be signed. People throughout the world have felt that agreements on real disarmament are possible and that it is possible to move in the direction of the complete elimination of nuclear arsenals without harming anybody and with universal security being strengthened.

In welcoming the future treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles as a "victory for sense," a "historic milestone," and a "breakthrough in the field of arms control" that could become a turning point in world development, governments, states, political and public figures, and press organs throughout the world are expressing the hope that this treaty will give a powerful new impetus to the development of East-West relations and open the way to new and far-reaching measures to reduce and destroy nuclear arsenals.

For the first time in history, French Communist Party Secretary General G. Marchais noted in his report to the PCF congress last week, the two biggest military powers are going to destroy some of the most terrifying categories of weapons that they possess. Arms agreements have been concluded in the past, but on every occasion they have been concerned with the limitation of one or two types of weapons, which has not prevented the development of other types. This time we are talking about something completely different: the elimination and destruction of existing arms. An opportunity is thereby being opened up for implementing people's age-old dream of living in conditions of security and peace.

The Soviet Union is going to the upcoming summit firmly determined to strive for tangible progress in eliminating the nuclear threat hanging over the world and solving urgent international problems while strictly upholding the principle of equal security. Regarding the visit to the United States as an important stage in Soviet-American relations, the Soviet leadership considers that the question of halving strategic offensive weapons and preventing the placing of weapons in space is at the heart of these relations.

For all the tremendous importance of the medium- and shorter-range missile treaty, these two classes of missiles constitute only a small proportion of the two countries' nuclear arsenals. The realities of the modern world are such that it is precisely strategic arms which account for around 96% of the U.S. and USSR nuclear potentials. Experts estimate that only a small proportion of these arsenals are sufficient to destroy life on earth. This is why, in addition to the signing of the treaty and the discussion of other international problems, it is so imperative in the course of the meeting to make progress in this key area of nuclear disarmament.

It can be said in advance that a great deal of difficult work lies ahead, but it is the Soviet Union's conviction that mutually acceptable decisions on radically reducing strategic offensive arms are not only possible but achievable given a mutual desire by the sides to act constructively. For the USSR's part, it is acting in precisely this way, and the world has already been able to be convinced of its readiness. In other words, real preconditions exist—particularly the experience in seeking ways to untangle knotty problems accumulated in the course of talks—for resolving the question of radically reducing strategic offensive arms.

The many people who share this conviction today include the Christian Democrat Antonio Pandiscia (Italy), secretary general of the National Commission for Peace and the Development of Cultural Ties and Friendship Among Peoples. The upcoming summit, he stated, will be an event of exceptionally great significance for the fate of peace. All the necessary preconditions now exist for conducting a serious and constructive dialogue with a view to moving toward disarmament and a nuclear-free future on earth.

The overwhelming majority of Americans—ordinary citizens, prominent politicians, academics, and public organizations—are also speaking out in support of the upcoming summit meeting. Expressing the dominant mood, Martin Melkonian of the city of Hampstead exclaims in a letter to NEWSDAY: "The entire world is right to rejoice at the upcoming conclusion of the agreement!"

No Letup by the "Hawks" [subhead]

However, far from everyone in America is rejoicing. Moreover, the recent past has seen a sharp increase in the activity of reactionary circles and all kinds of right-wing and militarist organizations who are unleashing a campaign not only against the treaty but against the entire arms control process. Terrified at the prospect of the establishment of normal and good relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, extreme conservative organizations and groups and individual congressmen are calling in articles and on the radio for a "hard line" toward the USSR, and are working on members of the U.S. Senate in the hope of preventing the ratification and implementation of the treaty. In the opinion of a number of senators, the main efforts of the opponents of the Soviet-American agreement are aimed at introducing various amendments which would be unacceptable to the U.S. Administration or the Soviet Union. At the same time fears that the signing of the treaty will result in a "lessening of the security" of the United States and its allies are being deliberately fueled.

There are also considerable forces in other NATO countries that continue to worship the nuclear idol and think in terms of military superiority. Most state figures in the West seem to approve of the changes that are taking place. At the same time attention is directed toward the attempts being made there to halt or even reverse the movement toward positive changes in the world. People in the NATO countries are continuing to vigorously defend the policy of "nuclear deterrence," that is, to gamble on the preservation and further improvement of nuclear weapons. Concern is also evoked by the activity of opponents of the relaxation of tension, who are striving even now, on the very eve of its signing, to neutralize the Soviet-U.S. treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles by campaigning for "compensation" for the missiles to be destroyed, for "balance through upgrading," and so forth. This, in particular, is the essence of the decisions of the recent session of the NATO Military Planning Committee at defense minister level, whose participants advocated the accelerated modernization of conventional arms and stated their commitment to the doctrine of "nuclear deterrence." As observers note, the words of the communique it adopted, which talks about the bloc's "determination" to safeguard the level, quality, and correlation of nuclear and conventional arms, conceal a desire to preserve nuclear weapons in the West at any cost and also sharply increase the accumulated stockpiles of conventional arms.

Attention is also attracted by the publication in the U.S. capital of material relating to illusory "violations" of the provisions of the ABM treaty by the Soviet Union, which was manifestly timed to coincide with the meeting. This is also the theme of a White House report which, as the Americans themselves acknowledge, repeats past allegations and yet again attempts to attribute to the Soviet Union deliberately fabricated claims of "possible" noncompliance with treaty commitments.

In the Soviet Union the American side's attempt to revive the problem of so-called "violations" of the ABM treaty is regarded as a step not conducive to the creation of a businesslike and constructive atmosphere in Soviet-american relations. As the USSR Foreign Ministry has authoritatively stated, the U.S. Administration possesses all the necessary information on this question. The Soviet side has presented exhaustive explanations on this matter to the Soviet-U.S. Permanent Consultative Commission and indicated the absence of any justification for raising this question on the American side.

The U.S. Administration's approach to the question of further disarmament measures is also evidenced by the stance of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations. Thus, during a UN General Assembly First Committee discussion of the question of an all-embracing system of international peace and security the United States and a number of other NATO countries voted against a draft resolution aimed at moving mankind toward a nuclear-free and nonviolent world, and then were alone among UN members in voting against a General Assembly resolution urging the prevention of the transfer of the arms race into space. In the light of these and other facts it is not difficult to understand why many Soviet people (judging both by the editorial mailbag and the results of a recent poll of Muscovites) are expressing legitimate doubts that the Washington administration is sincerely interested in a real process of disarmament.

In the Interests of Cooperation [subhead]

Assessing the agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles as a fundamentally important step toward the triumph of reason and an important prerequisite for the quest for solutions relating to a radical reduction of strategic nuclear arms, statemen in West and East are correctly noting at present that the Soviet-U.S. treaty has in fact a universal nature and corresponds not only with the interests of the USSR and the United States, not only with the interests of people in Europe, but also of peoples all over the world. Among them is Australia's head of government R. Hawke, who was on an official visit to the USSR last week at the Soviet Government's invitation.

The Australian prime minister highly appraised the Soviet Union's efforts aimed at easing international tension and solving the problems of nuclear disarmament. Acclaiming the accord reached on medium- and shorter-range missiles between the USSR and the United States, he noted that this historic achievement has a positive effect on the Asian and Pacific region, and it can only be the beginning. Achievements on a similar scale are necessary in the much more dangerous sphere of strategic arsenals, R. Hawke noted, calling for the destruction of the nuclear pyre built up over the last 40 years.

The Australian prime minister's visit, in the course of which questions of bilateral relations were discussed in parallel with topical international problems and agreements on cooperation in different spheres were signed,

including a trade and economic cooperation program for 1988-1995, was a major event in Soviet-Australian relations, testifying to the ongoing development of political dialogue between the USSR and Australia.

The talks, meetings, and conversations held in Moscow, which proceeded in an amicable and constructive atmosphere, confirmed both sides' desire to impart new parameters to Soviet-Australian relations and to raise their qualitative level. Mutual belief was expressed that the nature of relations between the Soviet Union and Australia corresponds not only with both countries' fundamental interests, but also with the cause of strengthening international peace.

People in the Soviet Union express the hope that the results of the visit will have a fruitful effect not only on bilateral ties but also on the prospects for the development of international cooperation in the Asian and Pacific region. The USSR respects Australia's stance on the nonmilitarization of space, the termination of nuclear tests, and the elimination of chemical weapons. It is actively interested in improving the situation in the Pacific basin, and advocates the easing of tension in this region and its inclusion in the general process of creating an all-embracing system of international peace and security, as proved by the well known large-scale Soviet initiatives aimed at easing military confrontation in the region, settling regional conflicts, and consolidating the atmosphere of trust.

The Soviet Union was the first nuclear power to sign the relevant protocols to the Rarotonga Treaty, concluded on the initiative of Australia and other countries, to create a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific. It unilaterally pledged not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and never to turn them against countries which have no such weapons on their territory. It is therefore perfectly natural that the two countries should cooperate in the sphere of consolidating security in Asia and the Pacific and establishing broad and stable cooperation in various spheres in this vast and densely populated region. The fact that our countries belong to different socioeconomic and political systems is no obstacle to the strengthening of such collaboration, because it is in harmony with the vital interests of all peoples, the interests of ensuring universal security.

International Situation—Questions & Answers

LD050830 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 4 Dec 87

["International Situation—Questions and Answers" program, presented by Sergey Pravdin, foreign policy commentator of Moscow Radio, with TASS Director General Sergey Andreyevich Losev; Vladimir Taranov, Moscow Radio correspondent in Czechoslovakia; Nikolay Agayants, not further identified; Vyacheslav Lavrentyev, not further identified; and Lvadimir Pasko, not further identified]

[Excerpts] [Pravdin] Hello, esteemed comrades. The remaining days before the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan in Washington have been filled with new content by the Soviet leader's interview with the U.S. NBC Television Company. You will have been able to see it on television or hear it on the radio and read o it in the papers. It has also been on television in the United States. [passage omitted]

Our radio listeners are also asking many questions connected with the forthcoming meeting. Sergey Andreyevich Losev, the TASS General Director, will answer them today.

The first question which I will put to you is from a group of teachers from the Political Economy Department of the Moscow Tsiolkovskiy Aviation Technology Institute. What can one expect specifically from this meeting?

[Losev] The world is keenly anticipating this historic event that is finally going to happen. No one now has any doubt that it will be a historic event. People have become excited about the forthcoming signing of the treaty on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles, which will for the first time in history lead to the complete liquidation of two classes of nuclear weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States on a global scale. The conclusion of this agreement conforms with the main direction of the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state—the elimination of the nuclear threat and the creation of the foundations for an all-embracing system of international peace and security.

This extensive document, which even without the appendix of protocols the text of the treaty runs to 120 pages, is based on the principle of equality and equal security of both sides and envisages the strictest measures of monitoring and verification [kontrol i proverka] so as to rule out the possibility of a violation of the agreement. In the main, the agreement exists because both sides have shown a readiness to take into account the other side's interests and to reach a compromise, balancing their own and the other's interests. Despite the obstacles created by the Pentagon, the principle that neither side should benefit or gain unilateral advantages at the expense of the other side's interests has held sway. It goes without saying that the interests of the defense of the USSR and our allies and friends have been observed in the most scrupulous way.

[Pravdin] Some of our listeners write that medium- and shorter-range missiles comprise only 4% of the arsenal of nuclear weapons of the two great powers. Does this not diminish the importance of the treaty?

[Losev] Indeed, 96% of the nuclear explosive power of the two main nuclear powers goes toward strategic armaments. This nuclear powderkeg is sufficient to destroy every living thing on our planet many times over. This in no way reduces the significance of the agreement

on the liquidation of medium- and shorter-range missiles. Indeed, the treaty creates a yawning breach in the wall of mistrust and suspicion, and ensures a psychological turning point which is so necessary in preparing an agreement on a radical reduction in strategic offensive armaments.

I recall that at the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Reykjavik our country proposed reducing by half strategic offensive armaments over a 5-year period, and, over the long term, their complete liquidation before the end of this century. Replying to the question by the NBC correspondent: what in your view are the chances that in the summer of 1988 you and President Reagan will be able to sign a treaty on a 50% reduction in really dangerous strategic missiles, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, replied: It seems to me that there are real prospects on this question, which is at the core of Soviet-U.S. relations. We believe that it is possible to do a lot of work under the present administration, and to make sound progress in this main direction of nuclear disarmament.

[Pravdin] In other words, the Soviet Union is ready to hold firm talks with the United States on disarmament in the period before the U.S. presidential elections in 1988, and is ready to continue them regardless of whether it is the Democrats or the Republicans who win?

[Losev] Yes, that's precisely how matters stand. In his conversation with the NBC correspondent Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev pointed out: We proceed from the fact that we will continue to work responsibly with the administration of any party, whether it is the Republican or the Democratic Party, or anyone else. We will cooperate, given the same desire and effort from the other side.

The practicalities of political life in the United States confirm that the new administration requires no fewer than 2 years before it can move toward concluding any new agreement with another power. In the present dangerous international situation it is hardly permissible to hang around and do nothing, hoping for a more favorably inclined administration to come to power in the United States.

[Pravdin] Let's go back to the problem of strategic offensive arms. At Reykjavik it was the U.S. stance with regard to the ABM Treaty that, as is known, became the stumbling block to achieving an agreement on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms. At that time Washington declined an accord on strengthening the regime of this open-ended treaty, and this was done in order to maintain for the United States the opportunity of deploying its Star Wars system and implementing the SDI program. How do matters stand now on the eve of the Washington summit? Many of our listeners ask us to talk about this.

[Losev] The Soviet appraisal of SDI as a dangerous program aimed at achieving military superiority and creating the potential of a first strike remains unchanged. Incidentally, it tallies with the opinion of many leading U.S. statesmen, including former defense secretaries and heads of space programs. For example, Dr Robert Bowman, president of the Institute for Studying the Problems of Space and Security, stressed the other day that the Star Wars program has nothing in common with defense. This is an attempt to achieve absolute military superiority by creating new offensive armaments posing as defensive ones. The purpose of this first-strike weapon is to obtain superiority in space, to destroy the other side's nuclear missiles, and to inflict one's own nuclear strike with impunity. They tell us, Bowman continued, that the United States has no alternative to pursuing SDI, since the Russians, they say, are carrying out their own Star Wars program. This does not correspond with reality. The Soviet Union does not have such a program. The Reagan administration's statement that the USSR is carrying out its own Star Wars program is deliberate disinformation of the American people. The only threat of deploying such weapon, Bowman says, emanates from the United States. The White House and the Pentagon still continue to claim that the administration has no intention of renouncing its SDI and that SDI is not a subject for bargaining. But no one, by the way, is saying that at the present stage SDI should be a subject for talks.

At the same time the Soviet Union is insisting upon strict conformity with the ABM treaty, which prohibits the deployment of space weapons. At Reykjavik as is known, the Soviet side proposed that an accord be reached on the nonuse of the right to withdraw from the ABM Treaty over a period of 10 years and put on record that laboratory research in the sphere of SDI would not be prohibited. Our country is even now ready to embark on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms, but in strict accordance with the ABM Treaty. The commitment not to use the right to withdraw from the ABM Treaty over a period of 10 years, with its strict observance, should be sealed by strict legislation. Only thus can strategic stability be guaranteed.

The Soviet position is supported by the overwhelming majority of the UN member states, including some of the United States' NATO allies. There would be no point in closing one channel of the arms race and at the same time opening another, even more dangerous one.

[Pravdin] Our regular listener, war and labor veteran Ivan Ivanovich Shchagin, writes: The United States is currently making great play about the possible difficulties which, they say, could arise in the way of the Senate's ratification of the treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles. The Naek family from Tula also asks about this. What can you say about this?

[Losev] Talks on the treaty have been going on for nearly 7 years, so it would be foolish and offensive to prepare for this agreement the same fate which befell the SALT II

treaty, which was not ratified by the U.S. Congress. Nevertheless, even now, before the signing of a new agreement, a campaign is being unleashed on Capitol Hill against ratification. An unseemly, suspicious row is going on. It is the maniacs in the United States who are leading this pandemonium, the ultraright-wingers, who are worried most of all that the new treaty will undermine the American people's support for huge military appropriations. The U.S. hawks are turning up their noses at the treaty. The right-wing organization, the Coalition for Peace from a Position of Strength, sent letters to 3,600 generals and admirals urging them to sign a petition to Reagan and protest at the agreement with the Soviet Union, which would allegedly constitute a danger to the United States in the face of the USSR's superiority in conventional weapons.

What can one say about this campaign of lies? The United States is no less interested in a treaty than the Soviet Union is, and the overwhelming majority of Americans support the treaty. We hope that their commonsense exerts influence on the Senate, too. In any event, the problem of ratification is not ours, but a U.S. problem, let them resolve it themselves. Efforts to use the so-called problem of ratification as a means of putting pressure on the Soviet Union, with the object of extorting unjustified concessions from it, are an attempt with worthless means, and nothing good will come of it.

[Pravdin] Sergeg Andreyevich, each summit meeting requires the creation of a favorable microclimate which would promote the success of such a meeting. Are there any signs that the U.S. side is making appropriate efforts?

[Losev] As far as protocol and the official side of the visit are concerned, then it would seem that everything is fine. However, what is alarming is that, alongside the representatives of numerous organizations who are sincerely interested in preventing a nuclar war, all kinds of rabble, from Zionists to Afghan dushmans are heading for the U.S. capital on the eve of the meeting. A Zionist demonstration in Washington has been widely advertised in advance. All these are depicted as some kind of spontaneous events. If this were so, it would be possible not to mention them, but there are, however, sufficient grounds to claim that some of these acts that are counter to the objectives of the summit meeting are inspired by certain U.S. services. Everything is proceeding according to its usual pattern. Even the rates being paid by the participants in the spontaneous demonstrations is known. But, you know, the home side, according to the laws of hospitality, should have nothing to do with such escapades.

[Pravdin] Matvey Dorofeyevich Zotov from Minsk and the Barkus family from Moscow ask: Will any other problems, apart from questions of disarmament, be examined at the meeting?

[Losev] The problem of regional conflicts is to be discussed. It goes without saying that the debate will concentrate on the problem of Soviet-U.S. relations, taking into account that the USSR and the United States are two powerful states with immense interests, allies and friends. The greater part of the world's nuclear arsenal is in our hands. The verbal assurances of the U.S. Administration about a desire for peace and mutual understanding with our country are, unfortunately, at odds with its deeds. The policy of the present administration is aimed at exhausting the Soviet Union by a nuclear missile and space arms race, to disrupt our restructuing and plans to improve the lives of the Soviet people, and to make as difficult as possible the development of economic relations and trade. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbahcev stressed, the leading problem now is how to change the relations between our countries for the better. Surely we can pool together the immense power at the disposal of our states, both economic and intellectual, in order to solve global problems? The Washington meeting should give an idea as to what the answer to this question will be. [passage omitted[

USSR Insists RSA Troops Withdraw From Angola

LD071310 Moscow TASS in English 1307 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS—The Soviet Union resolutely insists on the immediate withdrawal of South African troops from Angolan territory, Vladilen Vasev, member of the collegium of the USSR Foreign Ministry and head of the 3rd African department of the Foreign Ministry, said today.

He was speaking before Soviet and foreign journalists at a briefing here.

The U.N. Security Council, he recalled, adopted on November 25 a resolution, no. 602. "This resolution strongly denounced the racist regime in South Africa for the continued and stepped up acts of aggression against the People's Republic of Angola and demanded the unconditional withdrawl of all South African troops from Angolan territory.

The Security Council rightfully rejected Pretoria's attempts to justify its aggression by claims that the Angolan Government received assistance from Cuban servicemen and advisers and experts from the Soviet Union and other countries.

In connection with the Security Council's decision, the international public expects that the South African authorities will immediately withdraw its interventionist troops from the territory of sovereign Angola, a member state of the United Nations, of the Non-Aligned Movement and of the Organization of African Unity," said the Soviet Foreign Ministry official.

"Any subterfuges and reservations and any manoeuvring on this issue on the part of the Republic of South Africa are inadmissible.

All responsibility for the consequences of non-compliance with Security Council Resolution 602 will wholly rest with the Pretoria authorities." [quotation marks as received]

NATO Bodies Discuss INF Treaty, Arms Issues

PM071431 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Kharlanov dispatch: "NATO 'Winter Week'"]

[Text] Brussels, 1 Dec—The traditional winter sessions of North Atlantic bloc organs have begun at the NATO headquarters in a Brussels suburb. The military ones were the first to begin their work: First the "Eurogroup" sat, and then the Military Planning Committee session opened.

The defense ministers of the 12 member countries of NATO's "Eurogroup" expressed their governments' full support for the treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles to be signed during the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. The ministers also declared that they will try to secure the treaty's speediest ratification by the U.S. Congress. This was one of the chief results of yesterday's session of the NATO "Eurogroup" at the North Atlantic alliance's headquarters.

Wilhelm van Eekelen, Netherlands defense minister and chairman of the "Eurogroup," reported at a press conference that he will head the delegation of representatives of this leading NATO organ which will go to Washington to promote the ratification of the Soviet-U.S. treaty in the U.S. Senate. According to him, he intends vigorously to emphasize to members of the U.S. Congress the treaty's historic importance and its special significance for Europe. It has been decided to make this move in connection with the threat by a group of influential, extremely reactionary members of the Senate to oppose the treaty's ratification.

Both the "Eurogroup" and the Military Planning Committee allocated a significant place in their work to the problem of conventional arms. It is reported that U.S. Defense Secretary F. Carlucci brought with him across the ocean a report prepared by Pentagon experts for his predecessor, which says that the NATO countries must make extraordinary efforts to "compensate" for the elimination of the Pershing and cruise missiles stationed in West Europe by building up the most modern conventional arms. It is a question of types of weapons whose parameters approximate to means of mass destruction.

There is another report, prepared by NATO generals, on the military committees' table. It also envisages "compensation," but in the nuclear sphere. Speaking in London, U.S. General J. Galvin, supreme commander in chief, NATO forces, Europe, said that the doctrine of "nuclear retaliation" must be reinforced by building up ground-, air-, and sea-based nuclear means in West Europe and the adjacent seas. He declared that he will submit his recommendations on this to NATO military ministers, and can already foresee that there will be a "fierce struggle" over them. Although the general denies that his recommendations are aimed at "bypassing" the upcoming agreement between the United States and the USSR, commentators here point out that it is, in fact, a question of precisely this.

Another question is to be resolved during the "NATO winter marathon"—the appointment of a new NATO secretary general to replace Lord Carrington, who is retiring. It has just been learned that one of the aspirants to this post—former Norwegian Prime Minister K. Willoch—has stood down. The way is thereby cleared for FRG Defense Minister M. Woerner, whose candidacy is supported by the United States.

PRAVDA On Results of Meetings

PM071547 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent Yu. Kharlanov dispatch: "A Boulder Blocking the Road"]

[Text] Brussels, 3 Dec—The traditional winter sessions ofthe NATO military organs have been held at NATO headquarters in Brussels during the past 3 days. According to the final communique of the Military Planning Committee, NATO defense ministers, chiefs of general staff, and generals discussed a program to improve NATO armed forces and armaments in 1988-1992 with emphasis on the qualitative improvement of conventional arms. At the same time, the communique notes, the NATO strategists who advocate a "flexible response and forward-based defense" are also demanding that a certain level, quality, and combination of conventional and nuclear weapons systems be ensured.

How is this possible, journalists asked during a press conference held at NATO headquarters. In a few days' time a treaty is to be signed between the USSR and the United States which will lead to the elimination of two classes of nuclear missiles. Of late the paths leading to curbing the arms race and consequently also to curbing military budgets have begun to be widened. Why then are the NATO documents putting forward diametrically opposed demands? There is another contradiction. Formally the participants in the Brussels sessions supported the treaty between the USSR and the United States, which is called upon to lower the level of nuclear confrontation in Europe, yet at the same time NATO

Secretary General Lord Carrington insists on the need to develop and modernize NATO "theater nuclear weapons," which could be interpreted as an attempt to sidestep this treaty.

It was interesting to watch new U.S. Secretary of Defense F. Carlucci when he tried to prove at the press conference that the slight cut in the U.S. military budget need by no means serve as an example for the NATO allies, who should not curtail their military efforts. A certain amount of irritation in the Belgian press was also caused by a report that the new Pentagon leader had once again (and again unsuccessfully) tried to put pressure on his Belgian colleague F.-X. de Donnea to make him replace the "Nike" missiles deployed in the country with the expensive U.S. "Patriot" system.

Naturally, the NATO generals' boulder which has been lying about for a long time is hard to shift. However, as the experience of the Geneva talks has shown, if there is a desire on both sides to achieve real results even bigger obstacles can be removed.

Warsaw Pact-NATO Arms Talks Session Held
LD071345 Moscow TASS in English 1339 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Vienna December 7 TASS—A regular meeting was held here today within the framework of consultations between the Warsaw Treaty and NATO member countries with a view to working out a mandate for the negotiations on reducing the armed forces and conventional armaments in Europe from the Atlantic to the Urals. The sides continued harmonizing the provisions relevant to the goals of the future talks and methods to accomplish them.

USSR Joins Airline Crimes Convention
LD071534 Moscow TASS in English 1525 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS—It was officially announced here today that, according to the decree of December 4, 1987, the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet decided that the USSR would join the convention on crimes and some other acts committed on board airliners of September 14, 1963.

Gorbachev Arrives, 'Improvement' Sought
PM081219 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Meeting on American Soil"]

[Text] Washington, 7 Dec—Just like us, the electronic notice board at Washington's Andrews Airport seemed to be impatiently counting the time. The last few minutes before M.S. Gorbachev's welcome on U.S. soil. The last few hours before the event for which the whole world is waiting—the signing of the treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons.

It is 16 hours 40 minutes local time. An honor guard of the U.S. Armed Forces is drawn up on the tarmac. The state flags of the Soviet Union and the United States are flying on the masts.

The Soviet Il-62 taxies to the spot where the welcome ceremony is to take place.

The general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and his wife were greeted at the foot of the aircraft steps by U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz and his wife; J. Matlock, U.S. ambassador to the USSR; R. Ridgway, U.S. assistant secretary of state; and other representatives of the White House and the U.S. State Department.

Children presented M.S. Gorbachev and his wife with flowers—a symbol of hospitality and cordiality.

The CPSU Central Committee general secretary made a brief statement:

"Thank you, Mr Secretary of State, for your words of greetings and hospitality. I should like first of all, on behalf of the Soviet people, to convey greetings and genuine respect to the citizens of the United States. On behalf of the people and the Government of the USSR I assure all Americans that we sincerely seek an improvement of our relations. I have arrived in the United States on a visit in order to complete the work on the treaty, to sign the treaty on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles, the treaty for which peoples throughout the world have been waiting. At the center of our talks with the U.S. President will be the pivotal problem of Soviet-U.S. relations—questions of the reduction of strategic offensive arms. We have much to say to the U.S. leadership on this key question and we hope that we too will hear new words from our partners. We will be discussing other world problems too, of course, problems which concern peoples, problems which require a solution. We must act with utmost responsibility to our peoples and the whole world. The very fact of the third Soviet-U.S. summit and its agenda testify to the growing responsibility and understanding of this responsibility on the part of the U.S. Administration and the leadership of the Soviet Union. We favor a constructive dialogue, an improvement of our relations. I would like to wish peace and prosperity to the American people. Thank you."

The welcome ceremony is over. The motorcade, accompanied by an motorcycle escort, heads for the city center. Along the route the Soviet leader is greeted by the capital's residents.

At M.S. Gorbachev's residence a meeting with G. Shultz took place. An informal conversation over a cup of tea. A vast amount of work in Geneva and Reykjavik, where the intellectual breakthrough in Soviet-U.S. relations was achieved, lies behind. The two powers are on the threshold of a great act—the signing of a treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles. For the first time in the history of the disarmament process, the agreement does not merely impose restrictions and set quantitative and qualitative ceilings and subceilings on arms but leads to the real cuts in the nuclear arsenals.

The signing of the document will open a new stage of work which will be continued on Tuesday by the two countries' leaders. They will discuss questions which are of fundamental importance for ending the arms race on earth and preventing it in space, for ensuring a peaceful future for mankind.

The meeting was attended by E.A. Shevardnadze, A.N. Yakovlev, A.F. Dobrynin, V.M. Kamentsev, S.F. Akhromeyev, A.S. Chernyayev, and Yu.V. Dubinin.

The 8 December morning program will be preceded by an official cermonial welcome of M.S. Gorbachev by President R. Reagan. In conformity with U.S. state protocol it will take place on the south lawn of the White House.

Reagan on 'Easing Tensions', 'Goodwill'
LD080108 Moscow TASS in English 0055 GMT 8 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 8 TASS—One of the main objectives of the Soviet-American summit talks opening in Washington will be the discussion of ways for easing tensions between the two countries, U.S. President Ronald Reagan said in the U.S. capital Monday.

He said that two hours ago the plane carrying Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, had touched down on American soil.

The President noted that the Soviet leader and he would have talks with the aim of promoting peace between the Soviet and American peoples and peace on earth.

In the words of the U.S. President, the Soviet-American talks in Washington are beginning in the spirit of peace and goodwill.

U.S. Officials Discuss, Comment on Relations

Shultz: 'More Stable' Ties

PM071001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 87 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Must Utilize All Opportunities"]

[Text] Washington, 5 Dec—U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz delivered a speech at the Washington Council of World Affairs on Friday, in which he described present relations between the Soviet Union and the United States as "solid and substantive."

Speaking about the approaching summit meeting, the secretary of state emphasized that "utmost attention at the meeting will be devoted to arms control." "But the summit meeting will also reflect the hard work in the human rights sphere, the solution of conflicts all over the world, and the efforts aimed at establishing more stable relations between the two great powers," he said.

Dwelling on the process of profound changes occurring in the world, including the Soviet Union where, in his words, a "rethinking of old concepts" is under way, Shultz noted that "both the United States and the Soviet Union must fully utilize all opportunities to change the hostile nature of U.S.-Soviet relations for the better in the interests of peoples from both countries and the whole world."

Shultz NBC Interview Noted

LD071855 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1826 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] New York, 7 Dec (TASS)—"Our relations with the Soviet Union are extremely important and of a unique nature," said U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz on the eve of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington.

"Our two countries have the capability to destroy one another and the whole world within 30 minutes," he stressed in an interview to the NBC television company. Therefore, it is very important for us to conduct dialogue with them on arms control, regional problems, and human rights. Without this there is nothing to achieve. That is why we must support this dialogue."

On the forthcoming meeting between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan, the U.S. secretary of state said that its "success will lie in signing a very important treaty" on scrapping U.S. and Soviet medium- and shorter-range nuclear missiles. Noted Shultz: "Until now all treaties have led to major nuclear arms buildups. This is the first time that we will sign a treaty to reduce the number of nuclear weapons. That is success. In addition, we will work in the area of strategic weapons and I am completely convinced that we will make some progress here. That will be reflected somehow."

Shultz expressed the confidence that President Reagan will be able to get the INF treaty ratified by the U.S. Senate. This would come about "mainly because it is a good treaty," said the secretary of state, pointing to the "very reliable clauses relating to its verification [proverka]" contained in the treaty.

Carlucci Supports Treaty

LD080055 Moscow TASS in English 2356 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] New York December 8 TASS—U.S. Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci backed the Soivet-American treaty to eliminate medium- and shorter-range missiles.

In an interview to ABC Television network he said it was the first treaty in the history of arms control providing for the most stringent regime of verifying its observance.

He emphasized that verification measures worked out by the parties during the talks met the interests of the United States.

Touching on 50 per cent cuts in the arsenals of strategic offensive armaments of the U.S.S.R. and the U.S., Carlucci said that progress could be observed at the talks on that matter, although there were still many outstanding issues.

At the same time the secretary of defense said the United States would continue its work under the "Star Wars" program with the same determination.

Schedule for News Briefings Announced

LD071841 Moscow TASS in English 1626 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Washington December 7 TASS—TASS correspondent Igor Ignatiev reports:

Thousands of journalists who have come here from all parts of the world to cover the Soviet-American summit meeting thronged the halls and corridors of the Mariott Hotel in Pennyslvania Avenue where the International Press Centre opened today. Some 6,000 reporters, press photographers and operating staff representing various news agencies, newspapers, radio and television companies from dozens of countries are accredited there.

The press department of the White House also moved there for the period of the visit to the U.S. of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. A press group of the Soviet official delegation occupies two rooms.

A large board is installed at the entrance to a large hall where press conferences and briefings will be held during the summit. Information of the leading world news agencies—ASSOCIATED PRESS, UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL, REUTERS and TASS—will be displayed there. One can enter the conference hall only after

showing a special pass. The hall can seat 750 journalists, the TASS correspondent has been told at the U.S. Information Agency (USIA). For their convenience telephones are installed on the tables right there. According to representatives of the ATT Telephone company, 600 telephone apparatuses are installed in the conference hall alone.

It has been announced that twice a day, at 12.00 and 17.00, Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the Information Directorate of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Marlin Fitzwater, assistant to the U.S. President for press relations, will hold joint briefings at the International Press Centre at which they will speak about the course of the Soviet-American talks. Additional information can be obtained from numerous press releases displayed on the tables in corridors of the press centre.

Gerasimov-Fitzwater Briefing

LD072355 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2310 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Washington, 8 Dec [date as received] (TASS)— The first joint briefing by the official spokesmen of the USSR and the United States was held at the International Press Center set up for the Soviet-U.S. summit which began on Monday.

Marlin Fitzwater, assistant to the President for press relations, opened the briefing by stating: "President Reagan is coming to the summit with a feeling of realism and hope and with a conviction that a dialogue is necessary in the quest for peace. The President spoke for 15 minutes this morning with Prime Minister Thatcher about her conversation with the general secretary. Thatcher spoke to the President about their meeting. In the President's opinion, a very good conversation was held. Thatcher said that the general secretary is in an optimistic mood regarding the upcoming talks. Fundamental differences exist between our countries on a broad range of political questions. Although the two leaders will sign a historic agreement on the liquidation of a whole class of nuclear weapons, a considerable part of the summit will be devoted to other questions which determine our relations. We await discussions, during which these problems will be discussed frankly. The President is ready for the talks."

"We consider this summit to be of critical significance," Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the Information Directorate of the USSR Foreign Ministry, said. "We believe that we can start on the road to nuclear disarmament and that we can go down this road. We await the beginning of the summit with optimism."

Answering reporters' questions, G. Gerasimov and M. Fitzwater announced that there are no plans now for extending the summit. In connection with questions on the ratification of the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles, the White House spokesman stressed: We hope that Congress will examine the treaty and approve it in the form in which it will be presented. We understand that congressmen have the right to examine amendments and introduce alterations, but we hope that having examined the treaty, they will conclude that it must be passed in its current form.

Soviet Officials, Commentators on Summit

Gerasimov BBC Interview

LD071015 London BBC Television Network in English 0805 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Interview with Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov by James Cox in Washington—recorded]

[Text] [Cox] Earlier in the program I spoke to Kenneth Adelmann, director of the U.S. Arms Control Agency, who emphasized that it was NATO toughness and refusal to concede that brought the Soviet Union to the negotiating table. For the Soviet response I spoke to Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief spokesman for the Soviet Foreign Ministry, here in Washington to give the USSR side of the story. I first asked him to assess the importance of the INF treaty.

[Gerasimov] It is a major small step on the road to nuclear disarmament. It is a small step because it affects only 3 to 4% of the nuclear arsenals of the two big superpowers. It is a major step because it is the beginning, it is the crossing of nuclear Rubicon, that is why it is extremely important.

[Cox] Do you think this is a good augury for the START talks on cutting intercontinental missiles?

[Gerasimov] The centerpiece of the summit will be the discussion of this issue. There will be the signing ceremony, but the main things is to discuss the second treaty cutting by half all strategic forces.

[Cox] And do you think you will make progress on that?

[Gerasimov] We think we will, and the American side also thinks that it is possible, which means there are two political wills combined and when you have political will you can easily find the way.

[Cox] What about Star Wars, for example. I mean if President Reagan insists on going ahead...

[Gerasimov, interrupting] Star Wars is not on the agenda. This is something you must have in mind. This is not on the agenda. Star Wars is an American project. Maybe they have too many dollars they want to spend them on the fine dream of erecting a nuclear shield which is technically impossible in our view. So this is not on the agenda. So if we think that it is fine dream and it is technically impossible we also think that in the future, even when they want to put weapons in space, it will jeopardize strategic stability.

[Cox] The argument has been advanced here that it was NATO strength and determination which finally brought you back to the negotiating table.

[Gerasimov] No, this is the wrong reading of history. We came to the negotiating table because we had a change in command and the new leadership suggested that we must rethink certain things and we call it a process of new political thinking.

[Cox] Are you saying that under Mr Gorbachev there has been a change in the strategic priorities in the Soviet union?

[Gerasimov] There was a change in emphasis I guess, because now we have all the supplies for overkill and also we understand that we are in the same boat, actually it is one spaceship earth, and interdependence is where must find the solution to the question of national security together.

[Cox] Why has that changed now under Gorbachev?

[Gerasimov] That is why we say it is new political thinking. We are getting wiser.

Gerasimov Interviewed

TA060825 Tel Aviv IDF Radio in Hebrew 0600 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Telephone interview with Foreign Ministry Spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov in Washington by Ya'el Dan in the studio "a short while ago"—recorded; passages within quotation marks in English]

[Text] [Dan] "Mr Gerasimov, good morning to you."

[Gerasimov] "Good morning is for you. For me it's just around midnight."

[Dan] "Oh, yes, so good night. What do you expect from this summit?"

[Gerasimov] "Big progress."

[Dan] "In what terms mainly?"

[Gerasimov] "In the Soviet-U.S. relations, in disarmament, because we are going to sign one treaty..."

[Dan interrupts] Gennadiy Gerasimov answers that he is expecting big progress, progress on matters concerning the superpowers' military involvement in local conflicts as well as disarmament, since the Americans and Soviets are about to sign an agreement that will prepare the ground for one that will be signed in Moscow next year, when President Reagan arrives there.

[Dan] "According to the INF treaty, only 4% of the nuclear weapons will be cut. What do you believe will be the following, what will be the next step?"

[Gerasimov] "Well, it's a small step, but it's also a major step because it's very difficult to begin something. Then it will be the beginning of nuclear disarmament. Previously we talked about arms control. Now it's not just arms control, it's much more important thing: It's nuclear disarmament. So, we are going to sign a treaty..."

[Dan interrupts] Gerasimov said that in Washington the Soviets and Americans are about to sign a treaty that will affect only 4% of nuclear weapons, but that they are going to discuss an additional agreement that will lead to the dismantling of 50% of nuclear missiles. This will undoubtedly be a historic move.

Another question we posed: The Reagan administration made it clear it does not intend to withdraw from the Star Wars project; in your opinion, will this prove an obstacle on the road that has been taken?

[Gerasimov] "Well, this U.S. business, that they want to go, to continue with their SDI program which, for me, is, these letters stand for Space Defense Industry. [sentence as heard] It's up to them. Now, for us, the problem is we have..."

[Dan interrupts] This matter is up to them, Gerasimov replied. As far as the Soviets are concerned, we have the arms control treaty, Gerasimov says, pointing to the 1972 agreement and adding that both the Soviets and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz believe it is a good agreement. Therefore, Gerasimov says, the problem is very simple as far as we are concerned: All we need to do is to adhere to the old, 1972 agreement which deals with restricting technologies for ABM defense, and to expect that the Americans also abide by this agreement.

We asked Gerasimov what role the problems of the Middle East and Soviet Jewry will play in the talks with President Reagan.

[Gerasimov] "Well, the agenda is rather broad, and we will have discussions on bilateral issues, Soviet-U.S. issues; also, on regional conflicts—I hope including the Middle East; and also on humane issues, including human rights. And so it will be..."

[Dan] President Reagan said a few days ago that the refuseniks will be unseen participants in the summit. What can he and we expect concerning this issue?

[Gerasimov] "Well, it's up to him. He can do it, because it's on the agenda, this topic of human rights. We interpret it a little bit differently, so we also can raise several problems concerning human rights in the United States. So, it's two-way street. So it will be discussed."

[Dan] "Will you give any promise to President Reagan about letting the Jews get out of USSR?"

[Gerasimov] "No, we must listen to him, what he is going to say."

[Dan] "OK, Mr Gennadiy Gerasimov, I thank you very very much, and I wish you luck."

[Gerasimov] "Thank you, bye."

Ovchinnikov Comments

PM071121 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Article by Political Observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov: "Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington..."]

[Text] November 1985—Geneva. October 1986—Reykjavik. December 1987—Washington. Three Soviet-U.S. summit meetings in only a little more than 2 years. The very regularity of these meetings already attests that political dialogue between the USSR and the United States has not only acquired unprecedented dynamism but is also beginning to bear fruit. Although the two countries' leaders are to meet for what is now the third time in the gloomiest and most inclement months, one wants to believe that a thaw which could lead to an improvement in the political climate on our planet will come to relations between the biggest nuclear powers.

Geneva put an end to the dangerously protracted hiatus in Soviet-U.S. summit contacts. M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan not only made each other's acquaintance for the first time there but also pledged to build relations between the USSR and the United States on the premise that nuclear war must never be unleashed and that there can be no victors in it; that neither side will seek military superiority.

A year later, when the two leaders met again in Reykjavik, this initial principle was already being viewed as a prerequisite for possible actions. Although not a single document was signed in Iceland the results of the talks signified an intellectual breakthrough in Soviet-U.S. relations and revealed the possibility of gradually advancing toward a nuclear-free world. After Reykjavik the very nature of discussion between East and West changed. The idea of nuclear disarmament was transformed from a utopia into a route marked out on the map.

Now Washington is taking over from Geneva and Reykjavik. Today, 7 December, the CPSU Central Committee general secretary arrives in the U.S. capital. The main priorities for the two leaders' third meeting are to sign an agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles and to model conditions, that is to prepare the ground, for even more important accords during the U.S. President's return visit to Moscow in the first half of next year.

The treaty which is to be signed in Washington will lay the foundation to real disarmament. The parties to the treaty intend to totally destroy two classes of nuclear weapons and, moreover, the most modern weapons, and by no means obsolete or obsolescent ones. While formally a Soviet-U.S. agreement, this treaty is of an international nature because nuclear weapons with the destructive force of 200 World War II's are being removed from the territory of nine states. A seemingly impenetrable psychological barrier has been surmounted in relations between the biggest nuclear powers, which enables them to reach a qualitatively different level of cooperation in resolving problems of importance to all mankind.

The present agreement will reduce the nuclear potentials of the USSR and the United States by only 3%. But its implementation can augment the potential of trust between the two states to a far greater degree. Within the agreed schedule they must eliminate two classes of nuclear arms, reliably verifying each other's actions. The experience accumulated here will undoubtedly be of important assistance for subsequent, larger steps toward a nuclear-free world. These unprecedented standards of openness and depth in mutual monitoring and verification of the commitments made should above all help in resolving a task of epoch-making significance: effecting a radical, 50%, reduction to the strategic offensive arms of the USSR and the United States while strictly observing the ABM Treaty.

Consequently the agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles is valuable not only in itself but also as the initial impetus to the "domino effect" whereby all the other dominos fall in succession after the first, the impetus to a kind of "chain reaction" in the field of peace.

That is why extreme conservative circles in the United States have become so agitated. With their outbursts of anti-Soviet hysteria they are trying to poison the atmosphere of the Washington meeting. "The trouble is not so much the medium-range missile agreement as what may follow after it," Republican Senator J. McClure complains openly. "If the talks between the United States and the USSR go as planned, future historians may very well call 7 December 1987 the day of the second sinking of U.S. defense forces," Daniel Graham, a zealous supporter of the "Star Wars" program, announces hysterically. The only analogy which today's event prompts in the retired general is the 7 December 1941 Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

Yes, the idea of a nuclear-free world does have opponents. But the formula born in Geneva has proved viable. After all, stating that nuclear war must never be unleashed means acknowledging that the arsenals intended for it are unnecessary. The champions of the notorious "deterrent" are reminiscent of the dangerous eccentric who carries a mine close to his chest in the hope that it will protect the purse next to it from criminals. An increasing number of people are realizing that stocks of nuclear explosive are approaching critical mass capable of spontaneous combustion; that a civilization exhausted by the arms race could go into decline even without war.

Every fifth scientist on the planet is engaged in developing the tools of destruction. The numbers of servicemen are greater than the number of doctors and teachers. Just one-fifth of world military expenditure would be enough to eliminate hunger completely by the end of this century. Yet this year 300,000 people die on our planet every week from hunger and disease. It is as though the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki were repeated every week. Stockpiles of warheads which in terms of their explosive power are equal to a million potential Hiroshimas are being increased using funds which could save these people from death. The global problems of the present day have been woven into a tight knot. They can only be resolved comprehensively, by jointly taking hold of the key link: nuclear disarmament. Nuclear disarmament, first, generates trust and, second, releases the funds acutely needed for peaceful purposes.

That is the historical context of the meetings in Geneva, Reykjavik, and Washington. In additional to the official agenda which the two leaders are to discuss there is a question which equally perturbs us and the Americans: What can we become for each other in this diverse but integral and interdependent world? The realities of the nuclear space era do not allow us to be adversaries relying on force in resolving disputes. It would also be naive to expect that we will become like-minded friends. But antagonism between the two systems could acquire the civilized form of honest, open rivalry. Moreover, a recognition of the senselessness of nuclear war enables us to be partners in preventing it. After all, if the peoples of the USSR and the United States fought side by side against the brown plague of fascism, they could also pool their efforts to heal mankind of the cancerous tumor of the nuclear race.

Of course, it is not always that simple in life. But on the eve of the important talks in the U.S. capital I want to be optimistic. I want to hope that the Washington talks between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan will pave the way to the success of their fourth meeting in Moscow. That it will have a bigger share of heat and light not only because it is planned for the spring and summer months.

Kobysh: Anti-Soviet 'Campaign'

PM071117 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Vitaliy Kobysh "Political Observer's Opinion": "A Few Things About 'Atmospherics'"]

[Text] The time remaining until M.S. Gorbachev arrives in Washington can now be measured in hours, rather than days. Talks are beginning between the leaders of the world's two leading states, who can change a very great deal in the life of mankind. And, few people doubt, change it for the better. There is a belief that both the signing of the agreement on medium- and shorter-range nuclear missiles and the discussion of other questions relating to not only the limitation but also the elimination of nuclear weapons are capable of returning the peoples to a primordially normal existence—without the threat of universal self-destruction.

Is it necessary to say how many hopes people are pinning on this visit, the upcoming talks, and the prospects which they open up for present and future generations? Does it have to be explained that all this is in keeping with the interests of the security and survival of not only the Soviet people but also, and to an equal extent, of the peoples of the United States, Western Europe, and all other countries of the world?

Tourism is in no way the reason why the Soviet leader is going to Washington. Ahead lies intensive work which, I repeat, is of equal importance for both countries and the whole of mankind. It will also inevitably center on the question of the state and, we hope, the improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations. In M.S. Gorbachev's recently broadcast interview with the U.S. national television company NBC, which gave rise to widespread reactions throughout the world, he said, in part: "Leaving other questions aside, I want to talk about our relations. I will be going to Washington wishing to discuss this problem too. I believe that it is a major problem—how we can change the relations between our countries for the better."

The USSR's position on the eve of these more than important talks is thus absolutely clear. Not words but facts confirm that it is a constructive position based on goodwill and a desire to seek agreement on reducing tension in the world and remove from people the intolerable and no longer bearable anxiety about what might happen at any moment.

But what about the other side? Let us admit it, on the eve of such a serious event as a meeting between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President we have no great desire to indulge in polemics or, even more so, name-calling against anyone. But silence is impossible and would not be beneficial. Possibly we would not even bother to draw attention to the fact that certain circles in the United States which not only have considerable financial resources and access to the mass media but also maintain close ties with official circles have launched an extensive anti-Soviet campaign in the country in recent weeks and are attempting to extend it beyond its borders. They are definitely trying to torpedo the planned signing of the agreement on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles.

One of the vociferous representatives of these circles, General Henry Moore, argues that the future agreement creates "a dangerous illusion of benefit" for the United States. "Nobody is paying any attention to the quality of these missiles," he sermonizes. "The Soviet SS-20's are manifestly obsolete and would have had to be destroyed or replaced very soon anyway. As for the American 'Pershings,' they are the latest achievement in combat

technology. Therefore the deal is tantamount to exchanging a pound of gold for a pound of ash." So, gold for ash. But were these same Moores not squawking quite recently that the SS-20's were ultranew weapons which were lethally dangerous for Western Europe?

May God have mercy on them, these Moores. Serious concern is caused by something else. A few days before the start of M.S. Gorbachev's talks with R. Reagan the official U.S. authorities sharply stepped up their anti-Soviet campaign in virtually every field. The "war horse" in this campaign is their accusations that the Soviet Union is allegedly violating the provisions of the Treaty on the Limitation of Antiballistic Missile Systems (ABM). As stated in a USSR Foreign Ministry statement just published, the White House has compiled an entire report containing completely fabricated accusations against the USSR of violating the ABM Treaty, accusations which in no way serve the strengthening of mutual trust or the cause of the positive development of Soviet-U.S. relations. The USSR Foreign Ministry statement fully clarifies the situation. But nevertheless the question arises: Why was this needed right now?

This question also involuntarily arises when you familiarize yourself with the text of the U.S. President's interview with the newspaper IZVESTIYA. R. Reagan's interview contains good words which we fully reciprocate—about the United States' desire to improve relations with the Soviet Union. I acknowledge that some people will find it interesting to familiarize themselves with the lecture-like explanation of what real democracy is, especially after the details of "Irangate" have gone around the world.

What is not easy to understand is the President's assertion that the Soviet Union embarked on the development of SDI long before the United States, an assertion which, moreover, was "backed up" by references to M.S. Gorbachev's interview with the NBC correspondent. The Soviet leader said nothing of the kind, however; on the contrary, he said the direct opposite. In confirmation let me quote him: "...We will not develop SDI, we will not deploy SDI, and we call on the United State to do the same." A precise and clear statement. Any attempts to put interpretations on this are nothing more than a logical corollary of the White House "report" on violations of the ABM Treaty by the Soviet Union, which has a definite political purpose but is based on factual material of dubious quality, to put it mildly.

Somebody needs all this. Who? Obviously the people who wish to poison the atmosphere in which the upcoming talks are going to be held. It is up to the U.S. Administration itself to identify who is interested in "atmospherics," designed if not to wreck then to obstruct the upcoming dialogue as much as possible and maybe nullify its results.

One thing is perf[illegible] obvious to us. This kind of campaign agains[illegible]ming Washington summit has nothing to do w[illegible]ublic and the overwhelming majority of th[illegible]eople. A poll of the public conducted by t[illegible]ute showed that 80% of Americans belie[illegible]f peaceful coexistence, and a littl[illegible]ny actively urged the success of t[illegible] Soviet and U.S. leaders. As for [illegible]ntry, the corresponding figure[illegible] other words, the Soviet and U.S. [illegible]ful coexistence and want to live in peace and [illegible]ord. This is probably the main benchmark on the road to the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan.

Golts Ponders Summit Prospects

PM071147 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Second Edition p 3

[Observer Aleksandr Golts "Military-Political Review": "To Justify the Peoples' Hopes"]

[Text] We have a good custom: Before going on a long journey we sit down and think once again about what lies ahead. It seems to me that the recent NBC TV interview with M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was just such a thinking aloud about mankind's destiny. Its central theme was the thought about how to deliver mankind from fear and how to ensure a worthy existence for all the peoples inhabiting our planet. Yes, it was a real invitation to dialogue in the name of the future.

A very earnest dialogue lies ahead. M.S. Gorbachev's official visit to the United States begins tomorrow. Washington is far from Moscow. But not only our delegation has to make a long journey. All of mankind is at the start of a difficult path. A path comparable with a mountain ascent. At the summit lies a nuclear-free, nonviolent world.

The first step is to be taken on this ascent at the upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting: A treaty on the elimination of two classes of nuclear weapons at once—medium- and shorter-range missiles—will be signed.

In order to see the prospect more clearly today, let us recall how we fought our way to this point through the obstacles of confrontation and the ice fields of mutual suspicion. The new political thinking has been a reliable compass for our country here. Its foundations were laid in the documents of the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and the 27th party congress and in the CPSU Program. The approaches formulated in them are the continuation under modern conditions of the Leninist foreign policy, a policy which has always been built in accordance with the nature of socialism and with its orientation toward peace.

The starting point of the new thinking was the understanding that, despite all its contradictoriness, the modern world is interconnected and interdependent to a far greater degree than ever before. In this integral world the problem of the survival of the human race faces all countries and peoples with unprecedented acuteness. It is now obvious to everyone that nuclear war in any form—whether limited or universal—will bring about the undoubted destruction of mankind. In order to avoid this, nuclear arsenals must be eliminated.

It was not a simple process to become aware of this reality. It was not by chance that M.S. Gorbachev observed that the new political thinking was achieved through suffering. Indeed, the entire historical experience of our country, which has repeatedly had to defend its independence, repulsing invasions by foreign enslavers from the hordes of Batu to the Hitlerite hordes, has so far unambiguously taught that the state's security lies in its strength. We also remember what considerable effort it cost to eliminate the U.S. nuclear monopoly and then achieve military-strategic parity with the United States, thereby setting a limit on the policy of nuclear blackmail. But it has become obvious today that not even parity ensures security. The risk of nuclear catastrophe increases with each new nuclear warhead.

Then, on 15 January last year, the USSR put forward a global program for the phased elimination of all nuclear weapons by the year 2000. That program was developed and supplemented by proposals for the total elimination of chemical weapons and on the inadmissibility of transferring the arms race into space and by the concept of reducing armed forces and arms to the limits of reasonable sufficiency. The Soviet Union elaborated and proposed a system of very strict monitoring of the accords' fulfillment.

All this is the new political thinking in action. The Warsaw Pact states' adoption of the document on the defensive nature of their military doctrine must also be included in this.

The new political thinking has become not only a philosophy of life, of mankind's survival, but also a philosophy of action. This was why, back in the summer of 1985, the USSR unilaterally announced a moratorium on all nuclear explosions. We invited the United States to join that moratorium. It would have been possible to suspend the fast-moving process of the modernization of nuclear missile arms. As is known, Washington refused to follow the Soviet example. The 18-month unilateral moratorium showed the whole world that our country's words are not at variance with its deeds.

The historic Delhi declaration on the principles of a nonviolent and nuclear-free world proved that the new political thinking was taking over the minds of millions. The new thinking gave a strong boost to the search for ways to resolve regional conflicts. The meeting between Hun Sen, chairman of the PRK Council of Ministers, and Prince Norodom Sihanouk, during which problems of national reconciliation on long-suffering Cambodian soil were discussed, ended just the other day. Movement toward extinguishing a chronic hotbed of confrontation has thereby begun. The policy of national reconciliation is also winning positions, albeit with difficulty, in Afghanistan and Central America.

Whether the U.S. ruling circles want this or not, the new political thinking is also having an impact on themselves. Let us recall that 7 years ago people who saw the USSR only as an "empire of evil" and who dreamed of burning it in the flames of nuclear war entered Washington offices. Arms buildup programs on a previously unprecedented scale were fitted to those plans. However, they frightened their own people while trying to frighten the USSR. Americans saw that they, too, could not survive a nuclear battle, and then the administration had to carry out a course correction under pressure from public opinion. As a result, the summit meetings in Geneva and Reykjavik became very important stages in the search for paths to universal security. It was in the Icelandic capital a year ago that the door to a nuclear-free tomorrow was set ajar before mankind.

It is glaringly obvious, however, that official Washington's movement in a positive direction alternates with relapses of a kind into anti-Sovietism. Attempts are made to pass off the mutually advantageous accords reached with such difficulty as being a result of the U.S. position-of-strength policy. Here one recalls the recent television linkup between Soviet and U.S. parliamentarians. The deliberate aggressiveness of members of the U.S. Congress was combined in a noteworthy manner with an advertisement for a bank which appeared periodically on the screen. The bank's motto was the phrase that Americans must win, and not just survive.

It seems that many Washington officials have not yet entirely acknowledged the indisputable fact that ensuring universal survival nowadays means winning. Victory should be won not over the Soviet Union, but by all together, over the threat of nuclear catastrophe.

Take the administration stand on a question at the core of Soviet-U.S. relations—the question of a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms. The sides have already agreed on how many warheads they could keep. Thanks to the USSR's recent proposals, their positions have also grown closer with regard to the sublevels for each type of strategic arms. But the United States evidently has not abandoned the idea of "winning" at the talks and is demanding some additional advantages for itself on hardly plausible pretexts, reckoning on destroying the structure of the Soviet strategic forces.

The U.S. stand on the ABM Treaty is also far from realistic. In the USSR's opinion a reduction in strategic offensive arms is possible only with strict observance of that treaty. The United States (as distinct from its

previous position) no longer has the slightest wish to see a link between strategic offensive and defensive arms. It declares that it will never allow SDI to be made into small change at the talks.

As for SDI itself, NBC correspondent T. Brokaw involuntarily—or perhaps intentionally—pointed to the changed attitude of ordinary Americans to this program. If you recall, on asking M.S. Gorbachev a question he repeated a thesis which our country upheld in both Geneva and Reykjavik: The simplest solution to the SDI problem is to eliminate the need for "Star Wars" and secure a greater reduction in ICBM's, so there will be neither a political nor a technical need for SDI.

However, Washington does not wish to notice this simple solution and resorts to methods which cannot be called worthy. The press suddenly carries Pentagon statements on some kind of "red shield" which the Soviet Union is creating [sozdavat] and which even surpasses the U.S. SDI in scale. Or these cock-and-bull stories are supplemented by others claiming that the USSR is violating the ABM Treaty. To this end they have even tried to complicate the long since elucidated question of Soviet radars whose existence allegedly violated the treaty. But, as was declared at the highest level taking the U.S. side's concern into account, the USSR has dismantled the radars which were troubling the United States. You might think the question had been exhausted. But no!

As we see, there are many difficulties. However, the experience of Geneva and Reykjavik shows that during summit meetings solutions are sometimes found to problems which only quite recently seemed insoluble.

The planet's peoples await from the two countries' leaders a tangible contribution to the cause of strengthening international security. The entire course of the UN General Assembly session very clearly attests to this. The world community recently adopted an entire package of resolutions in the disarmament sphere. It unanimously hailed the reaching of an accord between the USSR and the United States on medium- and shorter-range missiles and their efforts aimed at drawing up an agreement on strategic offensive arms. A resolution banning nuclear tests was approved, as well as a resolution on preventing an arms race in space.

This opinion of the world's people must be heeded in Washington!

Bogachev: Treaty 'Major Victory'

LD071208 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Vladimir Bogachev commentary]

[Text] The forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit in Washington is attracting a great deal of attention from the world public. As is well-known, a treaty on the complete elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium- and short-range missiles is to be signed during the summit. Commentaries in the Western press on the draft of this treaty point out in particular that it may provide a new and mighty stimulus for the entire arms control process.

At the same time, certain Western observers express the opinion that the agreement which is being prepared will have no great military significance since it embraces only an insignificant proportion of the nuclear munitions existing in the world, they say.

Now listen to the opinion of Vladimir Bogachev, TASS observer on military matters on this score.

[Begin Bogachev recording] The conclusion of Western observers that the military significance of the treaty being prepared on eliminating medium- and short-range missiles is slight seems mistaken or biased to me.

Under contemporary conditions, the danger of one class of nuclear weapons or another is determined by factors other than their destructive capacity or so-called megatonnage. It is wrong to reach such conclusions simply because the treaty envisages the elimination of only 3% of the nuclear warheads in existence in the world. I must say that U.S. Pershing-2 missiles, for example, which should be destroyed under the treaty, are quite justly considered to be extremely destabilizing system. U.S. specialists call these missiles a highly provocative weapon. In fact, according to all the indices, Pershing-2's meet the requirements placed on a first nuclear strike weapon: accuracy and the possibility of being secretly prepared for aggression.

Furthermore, the point is that the flight time of these U.S. missiles from their bases in the FRG to vital targets on the territory of socialist countries is only 8 to 12 minutes. That means that the other side, the Soviet Union, in the event of receiving a signal indicating an attack will, in literally 2 or 3 minutes, have to verify its authenticity and decide on responsive measures against the aggressor. There is no need to explain that under such conditions there is a sharp increase in the risk of nuclear war being unleashed accidentally and unintentionally.

Finally, there is no doubt that the implementation of a treaty on medium-range missiles will cool the ardor of those who support the idea of a limited nuclear war. The apologists of pressure by means of force in U.S. foreign policy gamble on nuclear war being unleashed a long way away from U.S. shores, counting on aggression with impunity. Given the entirely illusory nature of such calculations, they are extremely dangerous not only for Europe but also for the United States. U.S. medium-range missiles in Europe were allocated the role of a fuse for a nuclear war which would embrace the entire world. The significance of the treaty on medium- and short-range missiles is determined by the fact that it will bring

about a substantial reduction in the level of military confrontation in Europe and, the main thing, will reduce the risk of a general nuclear war.

The destruction of medium- and short-range missiles will be a major victory for common sense. [end recording]

Borin on Attempts To 'Poison'

PM071301 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Lieutenant Colonel Yu. Borin article: "It Is the Behest of the Times"]

[Text] The upcoming Soviet-U.S. summit meeting is an event which is today riveting the attention of the entire world public. The peoples of the planet once again have the opportunity to see that the Soviet Union is persistently striving to improve relations with the United States, remove the accretions of distrust from them, and overcome confrontation and doing everything in its power to eliminate the threat of nuclear war. Only a person who does not want to face up to the truth and who does not want to take practical reality into account can fail to see this. Unfortunately, such people do exist in the West. Although they verbally acknowledge the importance of the Soviet peace initiatives, they are not in practice sparing any efforts to block them and are continuing to heap one obstacle after another in the path toward the building of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world.

However paradoxical this may be, at this time, when it is only a matter of days to the beginning of the Washington meeting, the Western press, and above all the U.S. press, is continuing to feature the cliches of yesterday and the political thinking of the past, mingled with anti-Sovietism and the strong-arm approach. They are to be found in abundance not only in the dilatations of "former" figures—Perle and Weinberger—but also in the speeches of official representatives of the U.S. political leadership. Even the most high-ranking. Thus, speaking quite recently to the American Council of Life Insurance, the head of the Washington administration himself, obviously to please the rightists, did not shrink from stating that he has, supposedly, "no illusions about the Soviet Union" and that the USSR has hitherto always violated agreements on arms verification the "day after" they were signed.

Such attacks "exposing the dishonesty" of the USSR in international affairs, which you can encounter so often in the U.S. press today, are in no way new. They were "invented" back in the early seventies when the Soviet Union managed to achieve approximate parity with the United States in the sphere of strategic armaments. This situation evoked furious anger from arms manufacturers and their political proteges. In order to justify their course aimed at achieving nuclear superiority over the USSR and the colossal expenditure on militarist preparations, the myth of the "Soviet military threat" began to be furiously publicized. It is also exploited to the utmost today. "In order to force the country to bear the burden associated with maintaining a large military machine," U.S. State Secretary J.F. Dulles, father of the "cold war," wrote in his time in the book "War, Peace, and Change," "an emotional situation must be created equivalent to the psychology of war. We must paint a picture of a foreign threat..."

To give this picture a veneer of authenticity some people in the West are endeavoring to attribute to the Soviet Union certain violations of international treaties and agreements. And at the same time—are endeavoring to whitewash their own, not mythical, but real violations.

Suffice it to mention the Interim Agreement on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms in 1972 (SALT I) and the 1979 Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT II) concluded between the USSR and the United States. Their significance lies in the fact that for the first time a legal contract basis was created regulating states' activity in the sphere of strategic armaments and the first steps were taken on the way to ridding mankind of the threat of an outbreak of nuclear war. However, in 1986 the U.S. Administration began to reject the terms of these most important international legal documents. In commissioning an additional number of heavy bombers with cruise missiles and at the same time exceeding the total limit established by the SALT II Treaty the United States effectively blew it apart.

The creation of new large U.S. early warning radar stations on the territory of Greenland and also in Britain are also evoking quite justifiable alarm in all those people who are concerned for the fate of peace. These actions in no way accord with the ABM Treaty but are an outright violation of it. The so-called "broad" interpretation of it which U.S. militarist circles are vigorously advocating does not by any means serve the strict observance of this most important Soviet-U.S. agreement. It is pursuing one goal—to legalize the transfer of the arms race into space.

The opponents of the relaxation of international tension are indescribably horrified at the prospect of a breakthrough occurring at the summit meeting in Washington, opening the way to a substantial reduction in strategic offensive armaments. The first step on the way to destroying nuclear arsenals is also the first step away from the rightists' scheme of world domination toward the creation of a nuclear-free and nonviolent world. Thus they are succumbing to anti-Soviet hysteria and are trying to obscure and confuse the issue in order to poison the atmosphere of the summit.

The world expects that decisions in the spirit of common sense will prevail. This is the behest of the times, necessary for mankind's future, including that of the U.S. people themselves.

Zhurkin: 'Optimistic'

OW071431 Tokyo NHK General Television Network in Japanese 1200 GMT 7Dec 87

[Vitaliy Zhurkin, deputy director of the United States of America and Canada Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, interview with newscaster Taro Kimura in Washington, date not given; interview conducted in English throughout, with video showing two men seated face-to-face, periodically cutting to closeup shots of each; from the "News Center 9" program—recorded]

[Text] [Kimura] Dr Zhurkin, what I found in Washington was a sort of backlash from the conservatives against President Reagan. Did it surprise you?

[Zhurkin] You know, the fact itself is not surprising, but the intensity of this backlash, as you called it—the hysterical, some hysterical forms of it to a certain extent are surprising.

[Kimura] What you call the ultraright, or rather conservatives, are very strong politically in this country, and the more they speak out, the more the issues like the Afghanistan problem, or human rights, or Jewish people's—become more of the issue than INF or other reductions of armament itself. For example, the Afghanistan issue. Are you going to come up with a clear—how do you say—answer to the American people when you retreat from that country?

[Zhurkin] You know, first of all I want to stress that a political decision has been taken by the Soviet Union and by the Soviet political leadership that the conflict in Afghanistan is to be settled politically and that political settlement should certainly include the complete withdrawal of Soviet troops. How to do it practically? As you know the discussions are going on between Afghanistan and Pakistan through the UN representative.

[Kimura] Are you ready with some sort of persuasive—how do you say—answer to this question, the human rights question, for the American people?

[Zhurkin] You know, I must stay there were times several years ago when our papers—when they wrote about human rights, they put it in brackets and it was considered malicious U.S. propaganda. Now there is a very serious attempt to settle problems of human rights and many actual deeds are undertaken by the Soviet Government; new laws are being developed and introduced. There is a desire to discuss human rights problems, not only in the Soviet Union but also in the United States, because we have our opinion about human rights in the United States.

[Kimura] It is my feeling that ordinary people here in the United States understand that the reduction of nuclear arms is something right, but in the bottom of their hearts they still have a fear or a doubt whether they should trust or take the word of their counterpart. What is the—how do you say—proposal, or the attitude of the Russian delegates to the United States this time?

[Zhurkin] You know, first of all you cannot develop trust through words, through rhetoric, however pleasant it is. It seems to me that mistrust has developed between our two nations for decades. There is a lot of distrust of the United States in the Soviet Union, among Soviet people, and certainly here in the United States I see a lot of distrust of my country, the Soviet Union. It seems to me that only through practical actions, when people see that it is possible to start reducing the levels of armaments and, in this process of reducing of levels—if it is done on equal basis under very strict verification—that in this process neither Soviet security nor U.S. security is threatened. It seems to me that only in this practical process, little by little a situation of trust will develop between our two nations, though I do not believe that it will happen as a miracle. It demands very difficult, very tortuous work by diplomats, experts, people on both sides trying to understand better the position of the other side. But I am rather optimistic: I think that it is possible to do, although it is difficult.

[Kimura] You said that you were rather optimistic. Do you foresee something like a new detente in the future?

[Zhurkin] It is very difficult to say, but personally, in my heart, so to say, I believe that when the first Soviet missiles, SS-20's or whatever they are, and U.S. missiles are destroyed, so to speak, before the eyes of the whole world—maybe we shall not watch it on television, but it will happen and we shall know that it is happening, and these are not some obsolete weapons, but very effective, very modern ones—I think that it may have very big psychological effect. Definitely, it will have a very big psychological impact in the Soviet Union—and I think that in the outside world it should have psychological impact, which will show the people that it is possible to do something practical. In this sense it is quite possible that we may have something better even than the detente of the early 1970's. Let us hope.

[Kimura] Cross my fingers.

[Zhurkin, laughing] Cross the fingers.

[Kimura] Thank you very much, doctor. Thank you very much.

Zagladin, Falin on Expectations

PM071533 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 3 Dec 87 First Edition p 3

[NOVOSTI correspondents' "International Survey": "Exploiting the Historic Opportunity"; first three paragraphs are editorial introduction; passages in boldface as published]

[Excerpts] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's interview with U.S. television immediately had a very broad response not only in the United States itself but throughout the whole world. This is natural. The planet's attention is riveted on an upcoming most important event—

the CPSU Central Committee general secretary's visit to Washington.

How do you conceive the further development of world affairs in the light of the anticipated results of the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in Washington? What hopes do you associate with it, especially in the disarmament sphere?

At SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA's request, APN correspondents put these questions to prominent political and public figures from several countries. Soviet participants in the international survey also answered these questions. [passage omitted]

V. Zagladin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee International Department:

I think that after Washington the world will be on the threshold of a new situation. On this side of the threshold, where we are now, there is unresolved confrontation, the incessant arms race, and the raging conflagrations of local conflicts. On the other side, there is the opportunity to cardinally change not only the atmosphere of international relations but also their real status.

I repeat: **the opportunity.** What the supreme leaders of the USSR and the United States are intending to do in Washington will be a real step forward. It will prove that the new thinking can be transformed into real practical work and that movement toward a nonnuclear world is not a utopia. But it will only be the **first** step in the right direction. Other steps lie ahead.

I am confident that it is possible to take these imperative, long-awaited new steps forward. But there will be many difficulties. There are forces in our world—and they are many—who are already thinking now about how to reverse the incipient movement. We must not let them do this. We must not let them block the further process of nuclear disarmament.

I personally think that in order to invest this emergent new process with the necessary dynamism we will have to to take care first and foremost to execute very strictly all the terms of the agreement that has been prepared on medium- and shorter-range missiles, including the verification provisions. We are not merely talking about monitoring but also about organizing a new cooperative mechanism in the security sphere, a confidence-building mechanism. Next—we will have to continue talks on strategic armaments, of course, in conditions of compliance with the ABM Treaty. They must be continued even in the event that people in the United States begin to stall the ratification of the Washington agreement. We must not waste any time! Of course, new efforts will be necessary in all spheres which engender distrust and real or imagined misgivings. In all spheres—from the sphere of local conflicts to humanitarian questions.

Academician V. Goldanskiy, chairman of the Soviet Pugwash Committee:

It is now clear that a historic agreement will be signed in December 1987 in Washington between the USSR and the United States on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles. I would like to hope that in its wake, at a meeting in Moscow, an agreement will be prepared on a sharp reduction in strategic nuclear armaments—by 50%—and that by the end of the 20th century nuclear weapons will have been totally eliminated. One must suppose here that the 1972 ABM Treaty will be strictly observed by both sides. I would like chemical weapons to be banned and destroyed; I would like nuclear-free zones to be created in Europe and Asia on the way to a nonnuclear world; and I would like these zones gradually to spread throughout the whole world. Moreover, I would like there to be a drastic reduction in conventional armaments and also a total ban on nuclear tests as soon as possible.

The Pugwash Movement, which has recently celebrated its 30th jubilee, sets itself the task of establishing mutual trust on the basis of close cooperation between the scientists of the entire planet in the struggle for peace and for the purity of the earth, and in the struggle to combat hunger and poverty. We have now begun to prepare for the next annual conference, which will take place in 1988 in the Soviet Union under the slogan "Farewell, weapons—this is the key to mankind's survival."

V. Falin, chairman of the NOVOSTI Board:

The results of the meeting in Washington, if all the objective premises created at the present time are exploited, may be extremely weighty for all subsequent development.

What do I have in mind first and foremost?

First. If the sides abide by the accords secured between them previously in Geneva and Reykjavik, the sense of which runs as follows: The cessation of the arms race on earth and the prevention of the militarization of space are proclaimed to be the aim of the policy of both states; both sides will ensure that nuclear war becomes impossible, and also any other war on earth. If this goal does not remain mere rhetoric but enters into the fabric of both sides' practical policy, the future of civilization, in my opinion, would seem considerably more rosy than it may appear today.

The question, however, consists of the following: the extent to which these objective premises or preconditions are utilized in practice. The answer to this question depends above all not on the USSR but on the United States. We are essentially experiencing a moment which has possibly never existed before in East-West and West-East relations.

The scale of the accords and their embracing of the problems of the quality of the solutions being achieved, especially with regard to verification and the elimination of individual arms systems, is today 90% dependent on the United States. We are prepared to go much further than the United States in all these spheres. We are ready to accompany any accord with the strictest verification [kontrol] system ensuring precise and complete execution of the sides' pledges and the most precise and complete verification [verifikatsiya]."

The present talks with the United States, which have enabled us to draw up the text of a treaty to eliminate medium- and shorter-range missiles, have shown that if both sides are willing, the most difficult and the most complex problems of security can be resolved, and the principle of equality and reciprocity remains the truest signpost to accord.

What hopes are emerging, especially in the disarmament sphere?

I would like the sides, during the 3 days of intensive talks in Washington, to be able to agree on the framework and general directions for future talks on strategic missiles, and on those concomitant issues in the main area of eliminating strategic-range, strategic-purpose weapons [oruzhiye strategicheskoy dalnosti, strategicheskogo naznacheniya] on which mutual understanding ultimately depends.

Next—I would like to hope that the talks in Washington will accelerate the formulation in the United States and NATO of constructive positions on weapons which are designated "conventional," although these weapons have long been of a quality which essentially renders impossible their comparison with the former weapons used in World Wars I and II or after World War II.

The West has been examining proposals from the USSR and the socialist countries for almost 2 years already. No satisfactory response, or no response of any kind has been forthcoming.

Next—I can and I would like in any case to expect a good and powerful impetus to the conclusion of the talks on banning and eliminating chemical weapons. The conditions for such an action are in place.

The preconditions and the historic opportunity can be grasped only in one event: when both sides are ready for it. We will find out in the very near future whether the incumbent U.S Administration will show such readiness and whether it wants to be guided in its policies by common sense rather than force, military force.

Petrovskiy Interviewed

NC041830 Athens RIZOSPASTIS in Greek 4 Dec 87 p 11

["Exclusive" interview with Deputy Foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy, by unnamed RIZOSPASTIS correspondent—date and place not given]

[Text] Correspondent: It is obvious that the entire world, and not only the USSR and the United States, expects the summit meeting in Washington to reverse international developments. There in Washington the foundations will be laid for the future agreements regarding the abolition of short- and medium-range missiles and a 50% reduction in strategic weapons...

V. Petrovskiy: The agenda is essentially an intense search for answers to the acute issues of world development that have been created by our nuclear-space century. The meeting will confirm the interdependence and contradictions of the current world, the urgency of world problems, and the threat to human existence itself. It is imperative to make and follow new regulations for international coexistence that will correspond to the conditions and needs that presently prevail on our planet.

From the very first days of its existence, the Soviet state made its choice to support peace, arms limitation, and detente.

Correspondent: We can almost say with certainty that an agreement will be signed in Washington, but we are not so sure that it will be ratified. The SALT II example is still fresh. How does the USSR view such a development?

V. Petrovskiy: You have correctly observed that the agreement will be signed. As regards its ratification, there are various views in the United States, even negative views, I would say, in the U.S. Congress. However, I believe that, in this instance, the Congress will demonstrate the necessary political responsibility and realize the significance of supporting an agreement that will hold special importance in the further course of international developments. Personally, I am convinced that logic will prevail against various reasons dictated by circumstances.

[Correspondent]: Academician Sakharov alleged in a statement to MOSCOW NEWS that it is not necessary to link the future agreement on strategic weapons with the ABM Treaty. He asked the Soviet Union to take unilateral steps, such as reductions in military service time and in military personnel...

V. Petrovskiy: Our country's position on these issues was confirmed by Mikhail Gorbachev in his interview with the U.S. television network NBC. As is well-known, we support an agreement for the radical reduction of strategic arms, with a simultaneous agreement for adherence

to the antimissile defense treaty. This is necessary in order to guarantee strategic stability at a time when the process for the significant reduction of strategic arms will be taking place.

Regarding the unilateral measures that the Soviet Union could take in the field of disarmament, as you know, such acts are not alien to our policy. The example of the unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing is recent. However, in order to safeguard unilateral actions in international policy, a corresponding response from the other side is necessary. In politics as in the theater, it is impossible to applaud with one hand.

Correspondent: With the implementation of the agreement that is expected to be signed, more than 1,000 nuclear warheads will be destroyed. Until recently, this was considered impossible. How have we reached such an important agreement?

V. Petrovskiy: Indeed, the world now stands at the threshold of true nuclear disarmament. One can realize the significance of such an agreement if one remembers that all the previously signed agreements did not envisage measures for disarmament, but only defined some limitations, some limits in the proliferation of nuclear arms. Currently, however, the concept of nuclear disarmament is acquiring its true dimension; it is becoming an effective factor in world policy. The agreement certainly constitutes only the beginning of the process for true nuclear disarmament, but, as your compatriot Aristotle said, "The beginning is the half of the whole."

In addition, we believe that nuclear-free zones in various parts of the world, including the Balkans, are important as transitory measures for the establishment of a world without nuclear weapons.

The CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and our party's 27th Congress were milestones in the formulation of the new Soviet theory for building a world that will be safe for all. In addition they have both played an important role in the conclusion of the agreements. This theory is expressed in the USSR's stance in the international arena, in its political style, in the concrete and constructive proposals we are making, in the pursuit of an open and honest dialogue, and the common search for solutions. The new political approach is a philosophy of action, a philosophy that continues to grow and be enriched.

Correspondent: Many believe that there is nothing they can do, that everything is decided by the two great powers, and that it is up to the great powers whether humanity will live in peace or be annihilated. How do you view the role of the peace movements in small countries on the issues of nuclear disarmament and the preservation of peace?

Petrovskiy: I believe that these allegations have never been less valid than they are now, because the preservation of peace has become the cause of millions of people. We believe that broad public participation in the discussion of problems of foreign policy and in its formulation process constitutes an indispensable component in the pursuit of certain peace and security for every country.

Efforts for a denuclearized and secure world through safeguarding the "balance of interests" constitute a general duty, because the abolition of nuclear weapons will be a most important step in the true democratization of international relations.

At this point I would like to add that there is a direct connection between the Leninist position on issues of security and disarmament and the Soviet Union's current position, which aims at shaping a world without nuclear weapons. The Soviet Union remains loyal to Lenin's declaration that "Disarmament constitutes Socialism's ideal."

Arms Curb Examined

PM070921 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Special correspondent Vladimir Kuzar dispatch under the rubric "On the Eve of the Historic Meeting": "Displaying Good Sense"]

[Text] While familiarizing myself with Washington, where preparations for the Soviet-U.S. summit are being completed, I, as a military journalist, could not fail to show interest in an opportunity at this time to visit the Pentagon—the holy of holies of the U.S. Armed Forces—and also the Marine Staff and the Defense Department Logistics Communications and Control Agency, which are also located in Washington. Of course I had no authorization to enter these buildings, so I contented myself with driving past in a car. But I did it twice—in the afternoon and late at night. Both times I saw the same sight: tremendous animation, hundreds of parked cars, and helicopters constantly landing or taking off. In the evening this picture was augmented by the bright glow from Pentagon windows, bearing witness to the intensive work here, which does not stop even at night.

Why this work is being done is also no secret. F. Carlucci, the recently appointed U.S. defense secretary, has stated that the Pentagon, despite cuts in appropriations, will do everything possible to ensure that the U.S. Armed Forces are in a high state of combat readiness.

While we're on the subject of appropriations: Although the U.S. Congress indeed failed to fully approve the administration's proposal on the size of the military budget for the current fiscal year, nonetheless the funds allocated are by no means inconsiderable—around $300 billion, of which for example, $264 million are earmarked for the production of another 12 MX missiles,

$775 million for the purchase of 403 Tomahawk sea-launched cruise missiles, and $658 million for 384 air-launched cruise missiles. In 1988 the U.S. Armed Forces will also receive other types of modern weapons, including weapons of mass destruction.

While continuing to intensively arm itself, the United States is also demanding the same of its North Atlantic bloc partners, as was confirmed by the latest session of the NATO Military Planning Committee. As THE NEW YORK TIMES reported, the U.S. defense secretary urged his bloc colleagues to carry out extensive modernization of conventional arms. Here he asserted that the Warsaw Pact has considerable superiority in this field. The Pentagon chief manifestly forgot about the existence of at least three Warsaw Pact proposals on mutual reductions of conventional arms.

Today, on the eve of CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the United States, U.S. opponents of nuclear disarmament are voicing increasingly vociferously their refusal to heed the voice of reason and display good sense. This is evidenced, for example, by a decision by the organization to implement the "Strategic Defense Initiative" to develop [sozdat] a new type of space rocket to put a "Zenith Star" laser installation into earth orbit. In this connection it is also impossible not to notice ultraconservatives' recommendations aimed at preventing a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms.

The Soviet side is going to Washington with the firm intention of seeking tangible progress and a specific result in the key question of eliminating the nuclear threat, reducing strategic offensive arms, and preventing the placing of weapons in space. This was discussed at a news conference held at the Soviet press center. It was said, in particular, at the news conference that at the talks in Geneva a treaty on reducing strategic offensive arms is already basically ready to go to the printers. But unfortunately there are differences on a number of its provisions. Some of them relate to matters of principle. Thus, the U.S. side does not want linkage between strategic offensive arms and the ABM Treaty and is demanding the the prohibition of mobile ICBM's since, in their view, they are difficult to monitor [kontrolirovat]. At the same time it is against the inclusion of cruise missiles in an eventual treaty because they too are...difficult to monitor [kontrolirovat]. What we have here is a manifest contradiction in the U.S. position—moreover, a contradiction aimed at obtaining one-sided advantages for the United States.

The Soviet Union is making tremendous efforts to solve the question of radically reducing the main nuclear arms. There is a good foundation for this, primarily the successful completion of the work on the medium- and shorter-range missile treaty, the experience gained in the course of that work, and also the readiness displayed by both sides to seek mutually acceptable ways to untangle knotty problems. I would like to cite the following example in confirmation of what I have said. When one of the U.S. journalists at the news conference I mentioned earlier asked if it was true that M.S. Gorbachev will be bringing new proposals on strategic offensive arms to the meeting with President Reagan he was given an affirmative answer.

The upcoming summit was also discussed in an R. Reagan interview with representatives of the U.S. mass media. According to a WASHINGTON POST report, the Senate has adopted a decision to start examining the Soviet-U.S. treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles on 19 January next year, immediately after the Christmas vacation. Ratification of the treaty is planned for early March.

However, it is not for nothing that the Pentagon's windows are lit at night. The pursuit of military superiority is not being abandoned here. The confrontation between sober-minded people and inveterate militarists is particularly tangible in the U.S. capital at this time.

PRAVDA on Atmosphere

PM070949 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Special correspondents Ye. Grigoryev, T. Kolesnichenko, and V. Sukhoy dispatch: "Just a Few Hours To Go"]

[Text] Washington, 5 Dec—You can hear Russian being spoken in the center of the U.S. capital. Television screens carry programs showing views from Moscow and "Russian scenes." M.S. Gorbachev's interview with NBC-TV was screened in full for a second time. In short, "the Russians are coming...."

It is no longer a matter of days, but of just a few hours until the summit meeting. The mass media "fever" has reached its peak....

Americans do not lack a sense of humor. For several days now television screens have been showing the same sketch time and again. Two actors, made up to look like the U.S. and USSR leaders, sit down facing each other and start a round of arm wrestling. First one hand, then the other is forced down close to the table. Who will win? There is no answer, and the scene is repeated time and again.

Joking apart, there are some people who seriously perceive Soviet-U.S. relations primarily from this viewpoint. But seriously, this is not the idea behind the meeting, and the essence of Soviet-U.S. relations should not boil down to competition, let alone military competition. The real essence is reflected in the treaty which will be signed here. It is reflected in the efforts being made by both our countries for the purpose of solving the fundamental problems of security.

The path to the third Soviet-U.S. summit meeting lay through Geneva and Reykjavik.

What is expected from the third meeting here? People expect the signing of the agreement. But they also expect something more: advance along the main avenue of nuclear disarmament. Will the word "Washington" become as symbolic as the word "Reykjavik"? There is no unambiguous answer. The right-wing press is raging and nervous. The Soviet Union is being publicly accused of treaty violations. Matters have reached the point where former Reagan supporters now see him almost as "Red" and accuse him of "forgetting U.S. national interests" and undermining NATO alliance commitments. But the psychological attack by right-wingers, no matter how loudly it may be conducted, is just further proof that the situation in the world is changing—maybe gradually, but visibly nevertheless. USSR foreign policy, the restructuring now under way in our country, and glasnost have become a factor of international life and have brought about a tangible change of attitudes here in the United States.

Of course, America has led and will continue to lead its own domestic life: "Irangate," inflation, the budget deficit, the sharp fall in the dollar's value—these are the problems on which attention is mainly focused. But now, on the eve of the meeting, the current state and further development of relations with the Soviet Union are becoming a factor in U.S. domestic as well as foreign policy. FOREIGN AFFAIRS Editor W. Hyland has remarked that people here "no longer support a foreign policy which does not rely on a desire for detente."

M. Dukakis, one of the candidates for the Democratic Party presidential nomination, said on television today: "The next U.S. President must be elected bearing in mind that he will have to deal with Gorbachev." This, in his opinion, presupposes breadth of thinking, sober consideration for the realities of the nuclear age, and a sense of responsibility for the fate of peace.

There is another noteworthy detail to which attention should be drawn. It consists in the fact that party dividing lines here are indistinct on questions of Soviet-U.S. relations. Who would have imagined that Reagan and his administration, agitating in favor of the medium- and shorter-range missiles treaty, would be forced to rely on the Democrats while their traditional allies, and even candidates for the Republican Party presidential nomination, would be attacking the future agreement?

"I am in a somewhat unusual position," Alan Cranston, leader of the Democratic majority in the Senate, told us when he received us in his office. "As a rule, I differ with the President on almost all issues, and now I am supporting him on the problem of destroying medium- and shorter-range missiles. I believe that this agreement extends the borders of our cooperation on disarmament questions. It is very important now to explain to people that the treaty was prepared on the basis of an honest and mutually acceptable approach. Some are worried about monitoring questions, but these questions have been given substantial importance and will ensure reliable verification of the treaty's observance."

At the same time, the senator drew our attention to the fact that the struggle for the agreement's ratification in the Senate will be far from easy. According to his estimates, only 50 senators support the treaty, between 10 and 22 will most likely vote "against," and the rest have not yet made up their minds. The support of 67 senators is necessary to ratify the treaty.

Generally speaking, the situation in Washington is far from simple. The administration is trying to calm passions in its own way. In a conversation with us, Assistant Secretary of State R. Ridgway noted that the White House is against the creation of an atmosphere of heightened expectations. There are fundamental differences between the USSR and the United States, she said. But "we look forward with impatience to the summit between M.S. Gorbachev and President R. Reagan, which has been particularly thoroughly prepared this time." In her words, the basic program of the visit will be the five meetings between the two leaders during which they will comprehensively examine the entire spectrum of Soviet-U.S. relations.

The world awaits. Everyone is pinning enormous hopes on the forthcoming meetings.

"No stopping"—this highway sign can be seen along freeways in many countries. It seems to us that such a sign would be appropriate along the historical highways of the development of Soviet-U.S. relations.

PRAVDA: 'Great Expectations'

PM071137 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Dispatch by PRAVDA special correspondents Ye. Grigorev, T. Kolesnichenko, and V. Linnik under the rubric: "Summit Meeting. Give Peace a Chance": "Great Expectations"]

[Excerpts] Washington—When the reader opens this edition of the newspaper, only a few hours will remain before the arrival of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in the United States. [passage omitted]

What groundwork for the future can be laid during the talks? What impetus can be imparted—for the first time in the history of mankind—to the incipient cause of eliminating nuclear weapons? Will the sides have sufficient courage and sense of responsibility to proceed farther along the path now outlined?

The expectations are great, and this is understandable. People in our countries and everywhere in the world want to have confidence in tomorrow. The upcoming 3 days in December can reinforce this hope.

One of the topics of conversation in journalist circles is the obvious nervousness and confusion of the rightists. They are even going as far as to make accusations against R. Reagan, accusations which were particularly stepped up after his interview with a U.S. TV company this week. For instance, R. Vigeri [name as published], one of the leaders of the "new rightists," asserts that the President has allegedly "succumbed to Soviet propaganda." This once again shows us that there are forces here for whom the policy of the incumbent administration, which for 7 years has indulged the military-industrial complex with almost $2 trillion in military expenditures, savors of "dangerous liberalism and spinelessness."

But the other America, that America which has formed a living chain, a symbolic "bridge to peace," from the White House to the Soviet Embassy, is not thinking in this vein today. [passage omitted]

The Soviet leader is well known here. Some people are even rather afraid of the impression he may have on Americans. For this category of people does not much feel like parting with the habitual stereotype of the "typical Russian" which emerges here from the pages of many works of literature and from movie and television screens. Some people are shuddering a little at the fact that throughout all America and throughout the entire world the truth will be told about our intentions and about our good attitude toward the American people, and about what sort of world we want to see tomorrow—a world without wars, without weapons, and without suspicion and hostility.

'Asymmetry' Seen in Attitudes

PM071048 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by special correspondents N. Yefimov, S. Kondrashov, and A. Palladin: "In the First Days of December"]

[Text] Washington—What is the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, measured in the simplest geographical dimension?

It is like this. From Moscow to Washington is approximately 10,000 km, but from the old but strong residence housing the USSR Embassy in Washington to the White House is less than 1 km. M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will live and work in the embassy building during the visit.

Let us add that on a neighboring street, a few blocks from the embassy, the members of the Soviet delegation will be stationed at the Madison Hotel, where the experts who arrived a few days ago are already stationed, while the international press center is comparatively close by, at the Marriott Hotel. By Saturday, requests for accreditation had been received from 6,500 correspondents and television cameramen from very many countries. The tremendous interest in the upcoming meeting is indicated by the following facts, for instance. One U.S. television company requested 700 accreditations for its employees. Only 500 were granted. THE WASHINGTON POST, as chief editor Bradlee told us, has assigned 75 correspondents to cover the meeting. So that is what the summit meeting means on the map of the U.S. capital, in its streets and squares.

Now for the chronological dimension, the program for the meeting. M.S. Gorbachev arrives at Andrews Air Force Base near Washington, designated as a government airport, at about 5 o'clock in the evening of 7 December local time, which is 1 o'clock in the morning of 8 December Moscow time—a time difference of 8 hours. According to the usual U.S. protocol in such cases, he is met by Secretary of State G. Shultz and other officials.

The official ceremony of meeting the President will take place the next day, 8 December—at 1000 hours local time. The Soviet leader and members of the delegation will spend practically the entire day at the conference table in the White House, where at approximately 1400 hours it is planned to sign the treaty on the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium- and shorter-range missiles. On the same day there is also a working luncheon and a ceremonial dinner—a reception with an exchange of speeches, also in the White House.

On the next 2 days, 9 and 10 December, there are talks in the White House and meetings between the Soviet leader and the leaders of the Senate and House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, Vice President G. Bush, and prominent figures from the U.S. business and intellectual world. On 9 December there is a reception in the evening, given by M.S. Gorbachev in honor of R. Reagan. This will be only the third time that a U.S. President has attended a reception at the Soviet Embassy.

Now it is time to leave the chronological dimension of the summit meeting, and move on to another, a highly complex and most important one—the political dimension. Life is not a bed of roses. This proverb can be applied to some degree to the history of Soviet-U.S. dialogue, its lessons, its ups and downs. The imperative of the nuclear age makes its way through them one way or another—the need for joint survival in a world where, especially on the part of the two superpowers, there is a surplus of lethal weapons and a shortage of goodwill. The growth of weapons stockpiles has outstripped the growth of common sense in Soviet-U.S. relations. The new thinking requires a change of priorities. The Washington meeting basically enshrines in treaty form its first success, placing on the altar of common sense, in the form of

a state promise by the two powers, the first few hundred missiles and the first few thousand nuclear warheads. This shows how extremely difficult it is.

Washington is already buzzing on the threshold of the summit meeting. The Soviet guest has not yet left Moscow, and people here are already discussing with growing intensity not only the program for his meetings in Washington, but also the possible results, not only the future prospects for U.S.-Soviet relations, including Reagan's planned visit to Moscow next spring or summer, in the first half of next year, but also how the dialogue between the two countries, as it gathers pace, will be reflected in next year's most important, long-drawn-out domestic U.S. event—the presidential elections.

In English, the top-level meeting has long been designated by one brief word, "summit," meaning "peak" ["vershina"]. It crops up in the early broadcasts of the latest news, and at night, until late, on the multichannel television which is practically round-the-clock here, they discuss the coming event in special programs or announce new programs on the subject. On Monday evening an hour-long interview with Gorbachev went on the air, and it was repeated on Thursday evening. Tuesday saw the transmission from Washington's Kennedy Center concert complex, for the first time in U.S. history, of a 2-hour television debate with 12 contenders (6 Republicans and 6 Democrats) for the presidential post in November 1988, and in the course of the debate there was an energetic attempt to clarify the participants' attitudes to the treaty which the two leaders will sign 8 December. The following day the newspapers commented on the unprecedented television presentation, noting the ironic paradox of U.S. politics today: The treaty has more support among Democrats than among conservative supporters of the conservative Republican President. Of the six Republicans only Vice President Bush (unreservedly), Senator Dole, and former Secretary of State Haig (with reservations) approved the treaty, while it met with unanimous understanding among the Democrats aiming for the White House.

Who could have imagined this, say, 6 years ago, when Ronald Reagan, darling of the American right and even the extreme right, came to power and at his first news conference in the White House, speaking about communist ideology and the Soviet leaders not merely negatively, but frankly insultingly, took a line of confrontation and curtailment of the dialogue which was already moribund in the last months of Carter's presidency? Who could have imagined that in 2 years of his second 4-year term this same President would meet three times with his partner from Moscow? November 1985—the reconnaissance in Geneva... October 1986—the meeting in Reykjavik, where an unprecedentedly broad nuclear disarmament task was set, came up against an obstacle in the form of Reagan's beloved SDI, but nonetheless gave new scope to the two powers' dialogue...

And now December 1987, and the two signatures that will be placed, before the eyes of the whole world, on the first result of that dialogue. Signatures that will seal the first steps along the path of real reduction of the nuclear Everests. Meeting on their political peak, the two leaders will this time cut off the topmost point of those Everests. True, it is not large, only 3-4% of the stockpiled arsenals, but that is the legal formulation of an agreement already reached, and the main political meaning, the main task of the upcoming meeting is to reach agreement in principle on how to cut the mountains by half, how to work together on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms.

But let us not jump the gun, still less with excessive optimism. First, for the treaty to become a fait accompli, it has to be ratified by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Senate. In the latter case, judging by the present noisy opposition in the camp of Reagan's disappointed supporters, this will be no easy task. Second, in order to make progress in talks on a 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms, the sides must reach agreement on complying with and not withdrawing from the Treaty on the Limitation of ABM Systems. The next few days in Washington will point to new progress or to a continuing impasse.

Arriving to cover the summit meeting and observing the passions of life here, you perceive that it is not only in weapons systems, but also in the existence of goodwill and the correlation of internal political forces that there is a kind of asymmetry between us and the Americans. The experts say: We have more heavy land-based missiles, they have superiority in submarine-launched ballistic missiles, we have more tanks in central Europe, they have tactical aviation or antitank systems. But another asymmetry should also be noted: They show more suspicion, and sometimes downright malice, at least on the part of a certain section of political circles, as well as many of our colleagues in the mass media. They are grieved by what they should, in our view, rejoice in. They see a trap where the doors are opening—for instance, in the unprecedentedly radical on-site monitoring measures which are provided for in the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles. They blow up the problem of human rights, by which they mean solely the freedom to emigrate from the USSR. They are excessively displeased by the fact that the mass of Americans now are more well disposed toward the Soviet Union and Soviet policy, while the Soviet leader, a stranger to them, is, according to a recent poll by ABC television and THE WASHINGTON POST, only 4% behind their own President in terms of popularity among this country's population.

On Thursday evening the main U.S. television companies showed on four channels an interview with President Reagan by their leading commentators. It was an instructive spectacle. The darling of the U.S. conservatives was attacked from the right.

It may appear that the extreme right, the ultraconservatives, are shooting from the hip, so to speak, without getting to the bottom of what is happening. It is true: They launched an attack on the agreement before they had studied it. In fact, they have not read it through to this day. The text has yet to be published. For the right, as leading political observers explained to us when we met them in Washington during these days, the problem is not so much the treaty itself, as what could follow it. In the words of Maynes, chief editor of the authoritative journal FOREIGN POLICY: "They, that is, the right, do not like the disarmament process itself, the very idea of reaching any accords with Moscow."

At the same time all the polls of the population, plenty of which have been held on the threshold of the meeting, show that the vast majority of Americans, while feeling both distrust and suspicion toward us, are nonetheless wholeheartedly for the forthcoming agreement and for an improvement in relations with the Soviet Union.

We were told: You should not overestimate the extreme right, they are a minority, but even our interlocutors added here that they are no mere minority, they possess a voice which has unlimited access to the television screens and the newspapers, which makes them a dangerous minority; and President Reagan himself, in the aforementioned television interview, said of them that in coming out against any attempts to reach mutual understanding with the USSR, they "have accepted in the bottom of their hearts that war is inevitable and that everything must move toward a war between the superpowers." We can assume that one of the most conservative Presidents in U.S. history knows very well who and what he is talking about.

That is the atmosphere on the eve of the visit, a complex, contradictory atmosphere. But who expected it to be simple or easy?

Further Reportage on Events, Activities

More on 6 Dec News Conference

LD062313 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2015 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Report on 6 December Washington news conference by S.A. Sitaryan, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee; N.V. Shishlin, "senior employee of the CPSU Central Committee"; and A.G. Aganbegyan, secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences; journalists' questions in English with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text] [Unidentified announcer] The news conference given by Soviet experts prior to the summit meeting in Washington was devoted to questions of economic policy during restructuring. Taking part in it were Academician Abel Aganbegyan; Stepan Sitaryan, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee; and Nikolay Shishlin, a senior employee of the CPSU Central Committee. [video shows Sitaryan, unidentified man, Shishlin, unidentified man, and Aganbegyan seated on rostrum] Prior to the start of the conversation with the journalists, Nikolay Shishlin said:

[Begin recording] [Shishlin] I wish to start by saying that you are well aware that restructuring is a process that embraces all spheres of life in Soviet society. However, before giving you a very brief outline of this, I would like to draw attention to one of the key aspects of life in our country at present. The strategic policy and the strategic line of work of our country has been defined.

This does not mean that the process of restructuring will not make some changes in this line, but, let me repeat, the strategic line has been defined. The time has now come to have this strategic line embodied in practical matters. Here, there are two key directions of work. The first is the democratization of Soviet society, the establishment [utverzhdeniye] of the socialist self-management of the people. The second direction, just as important and just as significant, is a radical economic reform.

[Unidentified journalist] One of the U.S. journalists was the first to ask a question: Is not the Soviet restructuring a lever to mobilize state-of-the-art technology and the economy for military purposes?

[Sitaryan] It seems to me that this has nothing in common with the purpose and the essence of restructuring. The purpose of restructuring is, first and foremost, to bring dynamism to the development of our economy, above all in the name of attaining the supreme goal—an improvement in the life of our people. The first steps of restructuring—modest though they still may be, for not much time has elapsed—bear witness to this. It is known that our economy develops according to plans. Well, if one is to sum up the preliminary results of the first 2 years of economic development which coincide precisely with the period of restructuring, one can note, being perfectly clear about it, that the fastest development, relative to the plan, can be observed in the social sphere. This concerns indicators such as the faster growth of housing construction and the building of kindergartens, hospitals, and schools. This concerns the solving of a whole range of questions connected with the improvement of the situation of working women and families which need the greatest attention from the state. In a word, the real course the economy ha taken over the past 2 years and the real course of the next year's plan have nothing in common with the opinion you voiced.

[Unidentified journalist] Many are interested to know when the Soviet people will begin to experience the results of restructuring?

[Aganbegyan] The first results of improving the life of people in our country over the first 2 years of restructuring have already taken place and that is why a proportion of Soviet families have already begun to experience the

fruits of restructuring. Over the past 20 years we annually handed over for use approximately 2 million apartments, population growth notwithstanding. In 1986, for the first time we handed over 2.2 million apartments for use. This year we intend to hand over 2.4 million apartments for use. This growth took place through a considerable redistribution of resources into housing construction and, naturally, hundreds of thousands of families have experienced this. We understand that this is small, and we intend to attain an annual level of 3 million apartments being handed over for use by 1990, so that 40 billion apartments and individual homes will have been built by the year 2000, and so that a separate apartment or a house is made available to every family. Here it must be taken into account that in our country the costs for apartments and municipal services are very low, amounting on average to 3% of the family budget. However, we reckon that there has been no radical breakthough as yet, and that is why new and major measures have recently been taken to develop the whole agro-industrial complex and the processing industry, the food industry above all.

I could say a few words about each of the social directions, to what extent the negative tendencies of the past have been broken over the past 2 years. For instance, the mean life span in our country has gone up by 2 years for the first time in 20 years

The mortality rate has gone down. The rate of growth in the sphere of services has doubled. Preparations are now almost complete for a new law on retirment, providing for a considerable increase in old age pensions. A reform of education is underway and R11 billion have been invested additionally. Teachers' pay has gone up by 30%. The pay awards for medical personnel are now in the pipeline. In all, resources are being redistributed into the social sphere. We attach priority importance to the development of the social sphere, because restructuring is being implemented in order to improve the life of the people.

So far, of course, by no means have all Soviet families felt the benefits of restructuring, but only 2 years have passed, and the task is being set of making a substantial leap forward in the next 2 or 3 years in improving the living conditions of all people, in their everyday life, and of ensuring that every Soviet family discovers for itself the effectiveness of this restructuring.

[Unidentified jouranlist] One of the questions dealt with a problem that is very topical for the Americans, too: To what extent does the success of economic measures depend upon cutting expenditures linked with arms limitation?

[Sitaryan] There is no doubt that development in this direction will encourage the acceleration of the restructuring process itself, in so far as it will make it possible to bring in new sources and to have at one's disposal greater resources for solving the tasks of social development. At the same time it will work at the main task of restructuring, that of intensifying the social development of the economy. One can only give the straightforward answer here.

[Unidentified jouranlist] The following question was also asked: It has been stated repeatedly and officially that resistance is being put up against restructuring. How serious is this resistance, and what are the specific sources of it?

[Aganbegyan] It seems to me that the resistance is fairly serious. This is linked with the fact that the restructuring of management is a radical restructuring: It is revolutionary in character, and of course it affects many strata of the population, the working people, primarily those who work in the management sphere. A considerable reallocation of rights is taking place, favoring wider independence for the enterprise and the association. Restructuring is therefore resisted primarily by a part of the management apparatus that is losing rights. Some of them are also losing their place of work in connection with the contraction and simplification of the apparatus in the changeover to economic methods. They fear responsibility and the making of independent decisions. They fear democratization, the change to the election of leaders by the labor collectives. Overall they want to work in the old way—that is easier and more convenient for backward economic managers.

Generally speaking, however, the main obstacle to restructuring is, of course, inertia, old habits, old ways of thinking, and this obstacle is linked not with some individual group; it exists within everyone, everyone needs to restructure himself in some way and to master the new methods. For this, time is necessary; it has to be studied, and of course it is easier to work in the old way than to change to something new. Restructuring, therefore, is a difficult and painful business, but it is a vital matter. It is a requirement of life, the desire and wish of the people and of all healthy forces in our society and of course, therefore, the driving force of restructuring is stronger than this resistance. We are optimistic about a successful outcome. It is an unprecedented process, let me put it directly.

[Unidentified Journalist] What place is given to foreign trade, and in particular to trade with the United States, in restructuring? Are any results expected in this respect at the forthcoming talks?

[Sitaryan] Unfortunately, it has to be noted that the volume of foreign economic links and trade and economic links between the Soviet Union and the United States is at a very low level. I am not going to go into an analysis of the reasons behind this situation, though it remains a fact. As we see it, it is in the interests of a faster development and deepening of economic links and in the interests of our two countries to expand trade and economic and scientific and technical links substantially. The thing is to take advantage of these opportunities. As

far as the United States is concerned, it seems to us that a whole series of restrictions which they place on the development of external economic links with our country clearly do not further a general improvement of matters in this area. From our side, however, it seems that new opportunities are now being opened up for using not just the traditional forms of trade but also such new forms as the wide development of cooperation and the setting up of joint enterprises. It seems to us that this is a way that is very promising, of benefit to both sides, and one that holds a great deal of promise. This should be taken up by both you and us. [end recording]

[Unidentified announcer] The changes in the USSR, the dynamism, the multifaceted nature of things, and the echoes in foreign economic matters are giving rise to growing interest in the United States. Many television and newspaper correspondents spent a long time talking with the Soviet experts after the news conference had ended, questioning them about the economic and social reforms in the USSR and the prospects for the development of Soviet-U.S. economic links.

PRAVDA on Moscow Peace 'Rally'

PM071029 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "The Will for Peace Will Triumph. Soviet Public Rally"]

[Text] On the initiative of the Soviet and Moscow Committees for the Defense of Peace, a public rally in support of the Washington summit was held in the capital 5 December.

Thousands of Muscovites, holding hands, formed a living chain which stretched east and west from the House of Friendship to the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium reception room and the U.S. Embassy on Tchaikovsky Street.

Along this human chain two bouquets of flowers with capsules containing the text of the public's appeals to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU, and U.S. President R. Reagan were passed. The peace messages had been unanimously adopted at the rally.

The message to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev says: "We are addressing you on the eve of a historic event—your meeting with U.S. President Reagan at which the agreement on the elimination of medium- and shorter-range nuclear missiles will be signed.

"We welcome the upcoming meeting and wish it a successful outcome. We see in the elimination of a whole class of nuclear missiles the practical embodiment of the long and persistent efforts of our country and all people of goodwill, both governments and wide circles of the worldwide peace movement. It will mark the beginning of practical progress along the path toward a nuclear-free world.

"While welcoming this first step, we believe that other practical measures called upon to completely rid our planet of nuclear weapons must follow.

"We are confident that the Soviet leadership will continue its peace-loving course aimed at ensuring life in a world without wars, violence, and weapons for the Soviet people and all mankind.

"We wish you success in the implementation of your historic peace mission!"

P.G. Gilashvili, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received the appeal first. A quarter of an hour later the ceremony of handing over the appeal took place at the U.S. Embassy where it was received by S. Pifer [name as published], the embassy first secretary.

Moscow Demonstrators 'Wretched'

LD071550 Moscow TASS in English 1546 GMT 7 Dec 87

["They Do Not Wish To See Tendency Towards Greater Democracy"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow December 7 TASS—It seems that today's reports of Western news agencies on the meeting of peace campaigners, held outside the building of the Soviet Foreign Ministry in the Soviet capital Sunday, were compiled by blind or deaf people. They did not either see anti-war posters, or heard ardent speeches by Soviet people calling for the Washington meeting to become the first step towards a nuclear-free world. But, on the other hand, these journalists clearly saw a wretched handful of renegades who shouted "I want to leave."

Virtually concurrently with the events outside the building of the Soviet foreign Ministry, dozens of person of the Jewish nationality, who received a visa to leave the Soviet Union, were staying at Sheremetyevo airport. However, few of Western newsmen paid attention to this circumstance. Why? The point is that the opponents of the relaxation in international relations are out to turn such an obviously speculative aspect of human rights as emigration from the USSR into a problem which, under their schemes, should emerge like a barrier in the way to the normalization of East-West relations.

There are objective statistics that the numebr of permissions to leave the Soviet Union has markedly grown lately—26,000 people, among them children, have left the USSR over the period that has passed since the beginning of this year, which exceeds many times last year's figures. At the same time, another tendency is observed—the applications for an exist visa, of which there are only several hundred now, are shrinking. And, finally, the third tendency—there are several hundred cases when persons who received the visa refused to leave our country.

In the recent interview with the NBC television network the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev said: "I think that right now we have among those who have not been given permission only those who cannot leave because of state security reasons. There are not any other reasons, and we will continue to act in that way."

Clergyman U.S. Arrival Blocked

LD051438 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0330 GMT 5 Dec

[Text] Washington, 5 Dec (TASS)—TASS correspondent Igor Borisenko reports:

The U.S. authorities have blocked the arrival in the United States of A.M. Bychkov, general secretary of the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christian-Baptists, who was supposed to particpate in a ceremony, coinciding with the Soviet-U.S. summit, as a member of a group of religious leaders from the USSR. This group was invited to the United States by the National Council of Churches.

The U.S. State Department found itself in quite a delicate situation, because it had to give at least some sort of explanation as to why a religious leader from the USSR who, by the way, has already visited the United States more then once, was this time refused an entry visa. Casuistry went into action. Ruth Dunhaven [name as received], a representative of the Political Affairs Bureau, stated that the visa was "not refused," the visa "was simply not issued," but "there are no guarantees" that it will soon be given.

However, as Robert Maddocks, leader of the U.S. religious organization "American United" found out, the delay with giving a visa to a clergyman from the USSR was far from the result of a bureaucratic mistake, but was the result of a "carefully thought out decision."

Charles Perry, senior priest of the Peter and Paul Cathedral in Washington, called this episode "bitter". It turns out, he said, that "it is possible to meet with top Soviet leaders and conduct negotiations, but it isn't possible to pray with clergymen" from the Soviet Union.

Religious Leaders Cited

PM071202 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Report by "our correspondent at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center" A. Kuvshinnikov: "Hope Unites Us All"]

[Text] Religious leaders of various faiths have joined their voices to those who wish for success in the Soviet leader's visit to the United States.

Metropolitan Pitirim, spokesman for the Moscow Patriarchy: On the occasion of the new meeting between the two high-ranking statesmen of the USSR and the United States, the Russian Orthodox Church has expressed its profound desire to give moral support to the spirit of the quest for a better way of life that is inherent in the important forthcoming event. Our participation in the peace movement reflects the internal condition of the Russian Orthodox Church, which has always been together with the people in years of joy and years of hardship.

A. Bychkov, general secretary of the All-Union Council of Evangelical Christians and Baptists: I regard the forthcoming event as a celebration for me personally, because by God's blessing I have been participating actively since 1970, together with American Christians, in the great movement to protect the sacred gift of life on earth against nuclear catastrophe.

R. Gaynutdinov, imam of the principal Moscow mosque: "In our prayers we ask almighty Allah that the meeting between the Soviet and U.S. leaders may end successfully for the sake of achieving mutual understanding between the peoples of the planet, as the Holy Koran calls for.

B. Gramm, chairman of the Moscow Jewish religious community: Unfortunately the question of the position of Jews in the USSR is all but stopping the discussion of disarmament problems. It is the conviction of the parishioners of the Moscow choral synagogue that these are disproportionate matters. The resolution of the main question should not depend on something as insignificant as the personal dissatisfaction of individuals.

It was reported at the news conference that the U.S. authorities refused A. Bychkov a visa to enter the United States to take part in joint prayers for the success of the summit meeting. He received invitations from the general secretary of the American National Council of Churches and the Southern Baptist Convention, which unite more than 55 million believers.

Opinion Poll Analyzed

PM071019 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 4 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5

[S. Dardykin report: "The Things That Bring Us Closer Together and the Things That Do Not," under the rubric "Joint Public Opinion Poll Held in USSR and United States on the Problems of Soviet-U.S. Relations"]

[Text] The words "for the first time" are applicable many times over to this public opinion poll.

This is the first time such extensive sociological research has been conducted into our two countries. This is the first time in its 50-year history that the Gallup Institute, which took part in the poll on the U.S. side, has worked on the basis of a questionnaire coordinated with a

foreign partner—the USSR Academy of Sciences Sociological Research Institute Center for the Study of Public Opinion. This is the first time Americans have been directly asked whether peaceful coexistence between the USSR and the United States is possible. The overwhelming majority—80% of those questioned—answered this question in the affirmative.

There is not really anything surprising in the fact that most Soviet people (84% of those questioned in the USSR) are firmly convinced that there is not and cannot be any acceptable alternative to peaceful coexistence; we have been brought up to think like this. But why should Americans, for many of whom this was the first real encounter with the combination of words "peaceful coexistence" and who, if one is to judge by the poll, still retain a strong mistrust of our country, so readily share this viewpoint? This will become much clearer if we look at the answers given to other questions in the poll. But first a few words about the poll itself.

One thousand people were questioned in both countries. The questionnaire method was used in the Soviet Union, whereas the poll was conducted by telephone in the United States. People living in Moscow, Yaroslavl, Belaya Tserkov, and Vasilkovskiy Rayon, Kiev Oblast answered the questionnaire in our country. In the United States the poll was conducted nationwide. According to sociologists, the poll provides a quite accurate picture of public opinion with a probable error in the region of plus or minus 3-4%. It must be added that the poll was conducted as part of the "International Barometer of Peace" project originally suggested by the USSR Academy of Sciences Sociological Research Institute. Also involved were the NOVOSTI PRESS AGENCY on the Soviet side and the journal NEWSWEEK on the U.S. side. Another important point is that the poll was held shortly before the forthcoming meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan in Washington, at a time when, for obvious reasons, Soviet-U.S. relations and related problems were at the center of public interest in our country and in the United States.

So, how do the two countries assess the development of bilateral relations and their current status? In the Soviet Union 40% of those questioned believe that relations have improved in the last 5 years, 24% think there has been no change, 15% see a deterioration, and 21% found it difficult to answer. In the United States, when asked about the dynamics of Soviet-U.S. relations, the respondents answered as follows: 52%—"relations have improved"; 37%—"no change"; 9%—"relations have deteriorated"; 2%—"difficult to say."

In the USSR 3% of the respondents are "very satisfied" with the current state of bilateral relations, 13% are "satisfied," 71% are "not satisfied," and 13% found it difficult to answer. The U.S. opinion: 4% are "very satisfied," 43% are "satisfied," 44% are "not satisfied," and 9% found it difficult to answer.

It is not hard to see that whereas in the first instance the opinions are approximately the same, in the second there are obvious differences.

Why should the Americans have such a rosy view—at least in comparison to the Russians—of our bilateral relations? Perhaps it is simply that we are more exacting in our criteria. As far as we are concerned, good relations consist in full trade without any boycotts, embargoes, or other discriminatory measures, uninterrupted cultural and scientific exchange, and simple, mutual respect without pinning labels on each other or "awarding points for good behavior," as well as progress in disarmament talks. But as far as the Americans are concerned, as long as talks are in progress and a dialogue has been established between the two leaders, nothing else really matters.

This explanation is borne out by the following. We have a greater interest in what is going on around us in the outside world. It is a common truth repeated 100 times over that for the ordinary American foreign policy comes at the bottom of the list: local news (about his own city and state), U.S. news, international news. Like any generalization, this needs to be clarified and sometimes varies, but it is obviously true on the whole. This is also shown by the answers to one of the questions in the survey. Only 36% of those questioned in the United States said that they are very interested in information on Soviet-U.S. relations, 49% admitted that they are "only slightly interested," and 14% said that they are not interested at all (in the Soviet Union these figures were 84%, 14%, and 0% respectively). To some Americans the world on the other side of the ocean seems smaller and less significant than their neighborhood baseball park.

The fact that there are shifts in opinion nevertheless is revealed by the sections in the poll where the respondents were asked to assess the dangers of the modern world. A total of 84% of Americans agreed that in a world nuclear war no one would emerge the winner and that the USSR and the United States would be completely destroyed (the figure was 81% in our country). As many as 65% of those questioned in the United States share the view that the continued buildup and sophistication of nuclear weapons will not benefit either side (the figure was 79% in our country). It is sad, of course, that the Americans and ourselves come closest in our awareness of the nuclear threat, but this coincidence of views is itself a source of hope. Again it suggests that there is no alternative to learning to coexist peacefully.

Our opinions are also close on how we can avoid a nuclear catastrophe. A total of 91% of those questioned in the USSR and 71% in the United States expressed the belief that a total rejection of nuclear arms tests would make it possible to relax the arms race. The opposite view was taken by 3% and 21% respectively. A total of 95% of the Soviet respondents and 72% of the Americans questioned said that neither the USSR nor the United

States should introduce weapons into space. But at the same time 40% of Americans are convinced that implementing the "Star Wars" program will help the cause of peace.

So what is happening here? Why this obvious contradiction? According to V.A. Marinov, senior scientific associate at the USSR Academy of Sciences Sociological Research Institute, who is responsible for the research on the Soviet side, the explanation should be sought in the actual formulation of the question. Weapons in space are, of course, a bad thing—most Americans are in agreement here. At the same time, however, influenced by U.S. Administration rhetoric on the peacemaking mission of the "Strategic Defense Initiative," many of them still believe that SDI is strictly defensive and does not constitute a weapon.

The attitude to "Star Wars" is something that clearly divides us. But mutual liking brings us closer together. A total of 81% of those questioned in the USSR replied that they have a positive attitude toward Americans, while 63% of Americans have a positive attitude toward us. Again we are divided on our attitude toward the other side's government. Only 6% of respondents in the Soviet Union have a positive attitude toward the U.S. Government, and only 11% of the Americans questioned expressed a positive attitude toward the Soviet Government. There are other signs of persisting mistrust which, to a certain extent, explain the preceding figures: 66% of Americans do not believe that the USSR will never be the first to use nuclear weapons. The same fear with regard to the United States was voiced by 37% of the respondents in the Soviet Union. A total of 71% of the U.S. respondents and 80% of the Soviets questioned do not agree that the other side's policy is chiefly defensive.

How did the poll participants rate the performance of their own leadership? A total of 82% of the Soviet respondents approve of the way M.S. Gorbachev runs the country (16% found it difficult to answer the question and 2% expressed disapproval). A total of 91% approve of his policy toward the United States (0.3% do not approve and the rest gave no opinion). A total of 51% of the respondents in the United States approve of the way in which R. Reagan fulfills his presidential functions, and 55% approve of his policy toward the Soviet Union.

Finally, the section of the poll that is possibly particularly relevant on the eve of the summit meeting: the respondents' "requests" to the leaders of the two powers. Problems concerning Soviet-U.S. relations were given in the following order of importance. The "Star Wars" program is at the top of the list (88% of those questioned in the USSR described it as very important). This was followed by the limitation of strategic nuclear arms, a complete ban on nuclear tests, the elimination of medium-range and shorter-range missiles, the removal of tension in the world's "hot spots," the expansion of contacts between people, the expansion of trade and economic ties, international terrorism, human rights in both countries, and a reduction in the level of conventional arms.

The Americans placed their priorities in the following order: international terrorism, the limitation of strategic nuclear arms, human rights in both countries, a nuclear test ban, the expansion of contacts between people, the easing of regional tension and conflicts, the elimination of medium-range and shorter-range missiles, the expansion of trade and economic relations, and only in ninth place—the "Star Wars" program. The U.S. list also ends with a reduction in the level of conventional arms.

Apart from the fact that in this section of the poll also the Americans clearly underestimate the danger of SDI, our attention is drawn to another telling fact: Respondents in both countries have an equally high opinion of the importance of the problem of the most destructive, strategic weapons. On the other hand, it is somewhat surprising that the question of conventional arms is bottom of the list in both countries. Perhaps this is purely psychological? Is public opinion in both countries so alarmed by the threat of nuclear weapons that all other types of arms recede into the background? This has still to be studied by sociologists.

The "International Barometer of Peace" is working. What kind of weather does it forecast? One would like to hope (Americans likewise, it seems) for a little more warmth in Soviet-U.S. relations. Another typical indicator can be cited in support of this hope. Most of the respondents (71% in our country and 50% in the United States) are convinced that the two sides' military forces must be equal. In other words, they do not wish military superiority for their country. Surely this is evidence of the new thinking gathering momentum, the belief that military superiority is unattainable and that nothing can be resolved in today's world by force of arms.

United States & Canada

1988 U.S. Defense Budget Compromise Analyzed

LD050602 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0440 GMT 5 Dec

[Text] Washington, 5 Dec (TASS)—On Friday President Reagan signed a bill for the U.S. military budget for the 1988 fiscal year, approved last month by both houses of the U.S. Congress. The document provides for allocations for military purposes in the current fiscal year, which began 1 October, of up to $296 billion.

A special written statement circulated by the White House on Friday expresses the President's satisfaction that the provision which had provoked sharp objections from the White House had been "removed or brought to an acceptable form" in the compromise variant of the Pentagon budget approved by Congress.

The head of the U.S. Administration has on more than one occasion threatened to impose a veto on the original version of the bill, elaborated by the House of Representatives. It had contained a number of amendments that demanded strict adherence by the United States to the "narrow" interpretation of the ABM Treaty, and also fulfillment of the conditions of the interim SALT I agreement and of the SALT II Treaty, which set limits on the number of delivery vehicles for strategic offensive weapons on both sides. As a result of pressure exerted by the White House on the legislators over the course of several months, not one of these agreements is specifically mentioned in the document that has now acquired the force of law. But it contains provisions elaborated as a result of compromise that pursue the aim of preventing the United States from further exceeding the limits set by the SALT II Treaty which the Reagan administration ostentatiously breached recently.

The New Pentagon budget earmarks $3.9 billion for continuing the "Star Wars" program. The White House statement notes that this sum is $300 million more than had been allocated to developing the wide-scale ABM space system in the previous fiscal year. Such a level of financing for SDI, the statement says, "will make it possible to energetically" continue the technological developments that are underway. At the same time the White House expressed displeasure with the reduction of the original request for implementing the "Strategic Defense Initiative", for which the administration had at first demanded an overall allocation of $5.7 billion. As said in the statement by the President's press spokesman Marlin Fitzwater, such a reduction in the rate of financing SDI will lead to "delays in conducting important experiments, both with space and ground-based equipment".

The new military budget lays great emphasis on increasing the U.S. conventional weapons potential. The document stresses that the possibilities of U.S. conventional forces and those of its NATO allies will play a more important role "if an agreement on medium-range systems should be concluded between the United States and the USSR", which, it will be recalled, will lead to the elimination of a whole class of nuclear missiles in Europe.

Jewish Group Rejects Congress Interference

PM031921 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Letter sent by Soviet Jews to members of U.S. Congress: "We Must Solve These Questions on Our Own"]

[Text] Esteemed Sirs,

We are aware that U.S. congressmen have over a number of years requested of various authorities that particular Soviet citizens be permitted to leave the USSR. They have generally explained these requests by the need to reunite families.

We know through personal experience that such cases most often involve disuniting rather than reuniting families.

It is in this connection that we Soviet citizens of different ages and with different professions united by a common concern, the concern to preserve our families, address you.

Each of our homes has been visited by the same misfortune: Someone from our family has decided to leave for Israel to be "reunited" with his "relations." We have been obliged to put the word "reunited" in quotation marks, for what sort of "reunification" can be involved when a person leaves those people who are closest to him in order to be "reunited" with people he has never set his eyes upon?! Whoever heard of Jewish children abandoning their aged parents or Jewish mothers and fathers deserting their children? Our people, who have always cherished the traditions of the family, have never known anything of the like before!

Several signatures are appended to this appeal. Each one of us has his own personal tragedy. Some of us have been faced with the threat of losing our parents, others of losing our children. Losing is the right word, because we have a very clear idea of what living far away from one another means.

We know that the Soviet Government has always regarded the problem of reuniting separated families with understanding. But our government, being consistent in its humanitarian policy, has always protected the family and its interests. We know that the consent of the closest relatives remaining in the Soviet Union is required when the question of the departure of a particular citizen is being decided. We want the rule to be strictly observed. Surely the desire of parents to see their children beside them, to have the opportunity to rely on them in old age, and receive moral and material support

from them cannot be disregarded? Surely children cannot be forsaken, denied the opportunity to see their parents, to care for them in old age, and to benefit from their worldly wisdom? How can one live far from those who are nearest and dearest, away from those who are one's own flesh and blood? These are all very complex and delicate questions. We think that they must be decided in the light of the interests of all members of the family and within the family circle alone. Any outside pressure is impermissible here.

We would like to emphasize particularly that in all our cases it is not a question of politics, it is merely a question of the fact that every family on its own must decide the question whether it continues to exist as a family or not. No interference or pressure at all is permissible.

We appeal to you to allow us the opportunity to decide our family questions ourselves; do not try to take from us this right, which is a sacred one in every country. Attempts to derive political advantage from our family tragedies are impermissible. If you really care about the fate of our families, then do be wholly consistent: Allow us to solve those questions which only we can and must decide on our own, within the family circle, and in the light of the interests of both children and parents.

V.P. Dulub, N.Z. Trishina, A.Z. Golikova, N.G. Tryasunova, and L.M. Zatulovskaya

Moscow

China

Korolev Comments on Hun-Sen-Sihanouk Meeting

OW062134 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0300 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Korolev commentary from the "Current Events and Commentaries" program]

[Text] The talks between Hun Sen, leader of the Cambodian Government, and Samdech Norodom Sihanouk ended in France. The following is an article by Station Commentator Korolev on this event:

[Begin Korolev recording] Many difficulties existed on the way to this meeting. Its opponents tried to hinder it by every possible means. However, the domestic regime of the people was consolidated. Many people realized that the Cambodian issue can only be settled through negotiations.

Phnom Penh proposed to let all the Khmer people return to their motherland—a proposal which means eliminating tension in Southeast Asia. The Cambodian Government put forward a specific program for national reconciliation, calling on the Cambodian people to unite together, urging those Khmer people who had resided abroad for various reasons to return to their hometowns, promising assistance for their employment and arrangements for their settlement, and guaranteeing their rights as citizens. The program also contained stipulations for Vietnam to withdraw its troops from Cambodia, for establishing a coalition government, and for holding a national general election.

To discuss these and other matters, Phnom Penh suggested a dialogue with the Khmer opposition. However, the Pol Pot elements who had slaughtered 3 million Cambodian people should be excluded from the dialogue. Sihanouk, one of the opposition leaders, agreed to a meeting with Hun Sen in the French city Fere-en-Tardenois for a discussion on ways to settle the Cambodian issue.

According to reports by news agencies of every country, the talks solved a series of questions at issue. The approved joint statement says that the Cambodian issue should be settled politically thru talks in which all parties concerned have participated, and proposes to hold an international conference on peace and stability in the region. Of course, no one expects this meeting to remove all the obstacles standing on the way to solving the existing problems. However, an old Oriental saying goes, a bright prospect of ten thousand li lies but underneath your feet. It seems that the first step has been taken.

Hun Sen and Sihanouk are scheduled to continue their dialogue in France in January 1988. [end recording]

USSR, PRC Sign Sci-Tech Protocol 4 Dec

OW050806 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Text] A protocol of the results of the second meeting of the subcommittee of the Soviet-Chinese Joint Committee on Economic, Trade, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation that confirms the scientific and technical cooperative installations of the two countries was signed in Beijing on Thursday.

The meeting also discussed the possibility of forging direct scientific and technical cooperation between the Soviet Union's Siberia and Far East region and China's Heilongjiang Province.

USSR To Supply Generating Units

LD061011 Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] The Soviet Union will help China build a major power plant in addition to the seven such facilities to be built under the agreement on economic cooperation between the two countries for the current 5-year period. The Soviet side has agreed to supply generating units for the station. The two countries cooperate fruitfully also in metallurgy, machine building, coal mining and textile, and other productions.

Daily Concludes Series on PRC Economic Reform

PM071455 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 2 Dec 87 p 3

[Second of Two Articles by Yuriy Kornilov under the rubric "Along the Roads of China": "Meetings in Sichuan"]

[Text] Sichuan Province, Moscow—During our travels around Sichuan we stopped to have lunch in the small settlement of Huaiyouai. A simple and, in its way, highly expressive sign caught my eye: "Restaurant. Cheap and Tasty." Catching sight of the newcomers, the owner himself—a youthful man wearing a cook's white coat—approached the little table. His name was Xie Guanjie and by trade he was a hairdresser.

"A hairdresser?"

"That used to be my speciality, but there were several hairdressers in the district and no good restaurants, so I decided to invest my savings in a new venture..."

"What happened?"

"The people in the settlement are happy and I have no regrets: There are so many customers that I have had to hire two helpers..."

Later, when visiting other settlements and rural district centers we saw for ourselves that a considerable proportion, if not the bulk of rural services are in the hands of enterprising people like Xie: Tea shops, hairdressers, workshops, stores, even relatively large trading enterprises operating, as a rule, on the principles of leasing. The economic reforms that are being carried out in the country threw off the shackles of the innumerable instructions and prohibitions—and enterprising people are now seeking spheres in which to apply their energy, knowledge, and, of course, personal resources to their own advantage and for the benefit of the common cause. This makes it possible to virtually resolve such problems as the quality of consumer and trade services but at the same time raises certain questions. For example, can an enterprising restaurateur like Xie not accumulate capital and open a chain of restaurants and become a monopolistic capitalist on a local, district, even a provincial level?

"No, that does not worry us," a leader of the district party committee answered with a smile. "Not only because under the law no one has the right to hire more than seven people. The main reason is that the basic areas of the national economy are under public ownership, and the levers of power are firmly in the hands of people's governments. What threat can there be from the private sector in these conditions? Yet this sector yields considerable benefit by helping to make people's lives easier and better."

He fell silent, then added:

"Near here there is an ancient Buddhist temple known as the temple of the Five Hundred Saints, whose gates are decorated with a large and beautiful hieroglyph signifying 'wealth.' According to ancient belief, anyone who closes his eyes, approaches the gates from a distance of 30 meters, and with outstretched hand manages to touch the hieroglyph will become a wealthy man. Thousands of people visit this temple to try their luck but, of course, no matter how many times they touch the hieroglyph it cannot change their lives. In our society the comfortable life is not achieved through the wave of some magic wand or the will of the gods, but only as the result of your own toil, sweat, enterprise, and initiative. This, I believe, is what the well known principle 'to each according to his labor' really means."

We had several meetings on the highways of Sichuan. These meetings varied in character but they all led to the same general conclusion: The economic reforms are having a deep effect on Chinese society, including the Chinese countryside, where more than 80% of the country's population lives.

In China, as the 13th CPC Congress held at the end of October confirmed with the utmost authority, people are now working on the clear principle that everything which promotes the country's modernization and helps to feed and clothe its 1 billion population is also working for socialism. That approach means that the people coming to the forefront are completely different from the "heroes" of the "cultural revolution" years. It is not the cadre "official" ["ganbu"], who had certain merits in the past but who has long been wandering in the labyrinths of outmoded dogmatic schemes, but the resourceful, energetic, and competent leader capable of boldly supporting all that is new and out of the ordinary, everything which can help to improve people's life. It is not the village loudmouth, skilled in urging people to "raise the red banner higher," but the strong manager, working when necessary from dawn to dusk and not hiding his desire to pressure his rival. It is not the ability to mouth extravagant slogans, to present reports which please the management, and to kowtow to the powers that be but a high level of professionalism, skill, enterprise, and initiative which are increasingly prized now. The words "fu" and "fuqilai"—"wealth" and "prosperity"—have ceased to be terms of abuse. "The transition to prosperity initially of some people with the aim of achieving general prosperity" is the formula guiding the architects of China's economic reforms. The fact that attainment of the goal will require tremendous effort and considerable time is not being hidden; on the contrary, it is being emphasized. Despite the fact that the proportion of so-called poor peasant farms has fallen in the past 6 years (1980-1986) from 61.6% to 11.3%, the country still has at least 100 million people on "low incomes," according to the official statistics. In practice, this means that for very many peasant families not only television sets but also such essential everyday items as, for example, a bicycle or a sewing machine are still an unattainable dream....

Economic reforms in China are continuing, and their results in agriculture are eloquently illustrated by the following figures: Between 1981 and 1985, the average annual growth of agricultural production was 11.4% and the annual growth rate of peasants' incomes was over 15%. But even though the figures speak for themselves, the reforms have not only millions of supporters but also quite a few opponents. "At the present historic turning point, a number of party members and responsible party workers have not managed to grasp the essence of the changes taking place," RENMIN RIBAO has noted. "They still have not abandoned their ostentatious extreme left [sholevatskiy] ideology and have doubts about the party's line in the countryside and in industry, which they call a deviation from socialism and implantation of capitalism." "We have achieved much; this is a fact. But if we are objective, it cannot be ignored that every step, literally every step forward that we take is the result of difficult struggle," Ye Benzhi, secretary of the Guanghan district party committee and a party congress delegate, told me.

The CPC Central Committee's report to the 13th congress entitled "Forward Along the Path of Socialism With Specific Chinese Features" confirmed the course of prolonging and deepening economic reforms and stressed in particular that the whole strategy of the country's economic development must be directed toward doubling the national product by the end of the century. The efforts of the 46-million strong army of Chinese Communists and the Chinese people are now being directed toward solving this most complex task.

Northeast Asia

Reportage, Comment on Upcoming ROK Elections

'Fierce Character' Noted

LD021319 Moscow TASS in English 0658 GMT 2 Dec 87

[Text] Tokyo December 2 TASS—As the December 16 presidential elections in South Korea draw nearer, the election struggle there assumes an increasingly fierce character.

The Japanese JIJI news agency reports from Seoul that clashes between supporters of conflicting groups took place there last night.

Several hundred toughs from among the ruling Democratic Justice Party, armed with metal rods, attacked the participants in an election meeting organized by the opposition party of Peace and Democracy. Its leader Kim Tae-chung, who is known for his activities against the rule of the military regime in the country, runs for the presidency. As a result of the clash, several tens of people were injured.

Church Groups To Observe

LD021323 Moscow TASS in English 0650 GMT 2 Dec 87

[Text] Tokyo, December 1 TASS—Religious organizations of South Korea announced that they will assume control of the holding of direct presidential elections fixed for December 16. They accused the governmental presidential candidate No Tae-u of the intention to rig the election results if the outcome of the voting is unfavourable for him and thus to ensure the continuity of the repressive military rule. Catholic and Protestant churches have played an important role in organizing and holding last summer mass manifestations against the military dictatorship, for the alteration of the constitution, the holding of direct presidential elections.

According to reports from Seoul, both churches issued instructions to two million believers to watch closely over the election, taking note of any violation. "We plan to train 100 thousand people and post them at some 1,300 polling stations and 245 centres for the counting of votes", said representative of the protestant Committee for the Observance of Elections Pak Chung-chol. He noted that many of them will have cameras to register abuses.

Oh Tae-sun, head of the Catholics commission set up last week expressed the opinion that there is now every sign that No Tae-u has no chances to win if the elections are fair. The former general, the closest associate and political successor of the current president should remove his candidature to the post of the head of state and apologise to the people for backing Chon Tu-hwan's military coup, Oh Tae-sun said.

The committees for the observance of the elections to ensure that they are fair were also set up by students. The authorities have been compelled to permit their activity and promised to admit foreign observers into the country.

Tikhomirov Views Campaign

PM301043 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Nov 87 Second Edition p 5

["Commentator's Column" by Sergey Tikhomirov: "Race Without a Leader"]

[Text] The indicator on the speedometer of the election campaign automobile, which started on 31 October in South Korea, is heading off the dial and passions are heating up: Half the road to the presidential elections has still not been covered, but even today the "speeds" of the contenders in the race are reminiscent of those reached in the final stretch. Who will win?

There are no out-and-out leaders, those who could most realistically be expected to win. Three men are running approximately even: No Tae-u, the ruling party candidate and successor of the present head of the South

Korean regime; Kim Yong-sam, chairman of the Reunification Democratic Party [RDP]; and Kim Tae-chung, leader of the Party of Peace and Democracy, which recently broke away from the RDP. Now these three, and also four undoubted outsiders, who include, incidentally, Kim Chong-pil, a prime minister under the dictator Pak Chong-hui, are traveling around the country's cities canvassing the electorate. By and large the political programs of the "two Kims"—Kim Tae-chung and Kim Yong-sam—are similar. Thus, the former is fighting to eliminate injustice in the redistribution of material wealth and states that it is he who is the true representative of the workers, students, and middle strata of the population. The latter speaks of his determination to combat corruption and struggle for democratization and so on. The main thing uniting the two of them is their appeals not to permit another general to come to power. As the opposition states, electing No Tae-u (who played a far from small role in the military putsch of 1979 and the bloody reprisals in Kwangju which followed in its wake—S.T.)—is the same as extending by another 5 years the tenure of the Chon Tu-hwan regime.

As regards No Tae-u himself, he, if we are to believe the news agencies, follows the well-known proverb: "Trust in the gods, but don't make mistakes yourself." "My candidacy is my destiny. Such is the will of heaven," he declared. But not a week later it was announced from Seoul that a special directive from the Ministry of Internal Affairs, providing for a whole complex of measures to force state employees to vote and to bribe the electorate to vote in favor of the ruling party candidate, had become public knowledge.

All the same, judging by political observers' assessments, the three leading contenders in the election race stand an approximately equal chance. Moreover, the same observers claim that 30% of the votes will be sufficient to gain the presidential chair. The finish—election day—is scheduled for 16 December, if, of course, something unforeseen does not occur on the campaign trail and if the South Korean military and their transoceanic patrons, who are observing the runners attentively, do not interfere in the race at the last minute, as has happened in the past.

Viktorov Comments on U.S. Report on ROK

SK010409 Moscow International Service in Korean 1330 GMT 28 Nov 87

[Station Commentator Viktorov on report published in New York: "South Korea At The Crossroads—Consequences of U.S. Policy"]

[Text] The International Relations Council and the Asiatic Society have jointly prepared this report that covers broad areas. Experts who took part in preparing the report include former U.S. Under Secretary of State (Bennet Bell), former U.S. Ambassador to South Korea Gleysteen, TIME magazine Editor-in-Chief (Henry Greenwald), and other renowned activists.

In the preface, the report notes that expectations are cast on conversations with a number of South Korean and U.S. public officials, politicians, historians, journalists, and university students.

Discussing U.S.-South Korean relations and the U.S. military occupation of South Korea, what concept do you think the writers of the report have formed?

The report has many flowery words such as the United States helping to insure South Korean strategy and independence and contributing to the so-called struggle of the South Korean people.

However, behind the smokescreen of words, which are hackneyed and totally removed from the truth, apprehensions can be felt over the present status of bilateral relations and their prospects.

The writers admit that Washington's interests are insured by military occupation. The (?report) points out that the U.S. occupation of South Korea has aroused the people's indignation, and stresses the strengthening view of university students and youths that the United States is pursuing its own interests in South Korea.

In their conversations with U.S. experts, university students stated that the United States should reduce the scale of its military occupation of South Korea as early as possible, stop its unfair economic demands, and end interference in the domestic political life of the country. This is a noteworthy fact.

The report notes that the United States pins high hopes on South Korea. Accordingly, the question of military ties between the United States and South Korea takes a prominent place in the report.

While stressing that South Korean generals should be given a more important role in the command of the combined forces, the authors of the report strongly oppose the withdrawal of U.S. forces from South Korea.

In addition, they point out that great significance should be attached to this in the U.S. Pacific principle in (?a concealed) form. This is no surprise.

This requirement is fully [words indistinct].

Washington is trying to draw its helpers into implementing its notorious Pacific principle and other enormous military plans.

An analysis of the military potential of the Seoul regime, which is included in the report, leads one to conclude that there is a tendency to continuously strengthen this potential.

Meanwhile, the authors of the report keep silent about the role played by the United States in the militarization process of South Korea. However, the United States is trying to bind South Korea more tightly in its military evil hand by continuously supplying new types of weapons to Seoul.

Some time ago, Washington's view became a decisive factor in the South Korean regime's domestic and foreign policy question. Now all indications show that different times are coming. The authors of the report do not deny that national sentiments are on the rise in South Korea. [passage indistinct]

It is natural that the authors of the report would try hard to help those who implement Washington's policy of protecting U.S. interests in South Korea.

For instance, they stress that the most important contribution the United States can make during an election in South Korea is to assume a neutral position toward the candidates, support the democratization process, and oppose the military's interference in the political life of the country.

Time will show whether Washington heeds this advice or not. However, this is not the main thing. It is beyond doubt that (?the United States) will do everything in its power to strengthen its imperialist position.

Washington considers South Korea an area of vital interest to the United States and one of the important [words indistinct] against the Far East.

Joint DPRK Textile Complex Anniversary Noted

SK302348 Moscow International Service in Korean 0930 GMT 29 Nov 87

[Station commentary]

[Text] Dear audience: A day, significant in the history of Soviet-Korean economic cooperation, has arrived. The month of November marks the 30th anniversary of the start of operation of the Pyongyang textile complex, which was built with Soviet cooperation. In this connection, a station commentator writes the following:

The completion of this enterprise was significant in Korea's postwar economic rehabilitation, and for the economic sectors producing the mass consumer goods in particular.

As you may know, the construction of the Pyongyang textile plant, the most important enterprise as far as the textile industry in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is concerned, was carried out according to an agreement reached between our two countries on economic, scientific, and technological cooperation.

Soviet institutions have fulfilled their share of the agreement, including drawing blueprints and assemblying, operating, and maintaining the necessary equipment after delivery, precisely before the deadline of the promised dates.

For technological cooperation with the Korean friends, groups of engineers and technicians from large enterprises in various Soviet cities were sent to the Republic. A project to train talented textile workers was also organized. Lectures given by Soviet engineers, [words indistinct], and skilled workers have produced more than 1,900 skilled hands. In addition, approximately 1,000 Korean textile workers undertook study in connection with production and technology in Soviet enterprises, especially in the city of (Ivanov).

Concentrated in (Ivanov), a city widely known as the textile center of our country, are the nation's largest (?combinates) and plants.

Highly appreciating the projects undertaken by the Soviet engineers, the DPRK Government conferred medals of the Republic on more than 300 among them.

As has been known, the Pyongyang textile complex is under reconstruction and is equipped with modern facilities. These facilities are expected to [words indistinct] and to increase [words indistinct] drastically. Soviet technology is widely used in reconstruction.

An amount of equipment, including [words indistinct] machine produced in (Ivanov), weavers produced in the city of (Glinovskiy), Moscow Province, and weavers produced in [words indistinct], have already been delivered in the capital of the DPRK. Also, six work team leaders at the Pyongyang textile complex have been trained in production in [words indistinct] plant in Moscow this year. Later, they were given on-the-job training in facilities similar to those exportedlby our country.

When its reconstruction is completed, the Pyongyang textile complex will play an important role in this sector and will supply the Republic with millions of units of fine quality cloth.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Ryzhkov Meets With PRK's Hun Sen 7 Dec

PM081110 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Friendly Meeting in the Kremlin"]

[Text] A meeting took place on 7 December between N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and Hun Sen, member of the Kampuchean People's Revolutionary Party Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the PRK Council of Ministers, who is in

Moscow en route from Paris. V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Yu.M. Vorontsov, USSR first deputy foreign minister, took part in the meeting.

During the talk, which took place in a cordial, comradely atmosphere, questions of Soviet-Cambodian relations and the international situation were discussed, including questions of a Cambodian political settlement.

Satisfaction was expressed with the present level of USSR-PRK cooperation in various spheres. At the same time, it was pointed out that considerable reserves still exist for increasing effectiveness of trade, economic, scientific, and technical ties between the Soviet Union and the People's Kampuchea. A mutual commitment was expressed to seeking new forms of cooperation, taking into account the peculiarities and potential of the two countries' economies.

In the course of examining international problems, the particular significance of the visit to the United States by M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was stressed. Hun Sen expressed the conviction that M.S. Gorbachev's talks with U.S. President R. Reagan and the signing of the USSR-U.S. agreement on eliminating medium- and shorter-range missiles will give a powerful boost to the quest for solving other disarmament problems and to steps leading to complete elimination of nuclear arsenals and settlement of other complex international problems. People in the PRK, the Cambodian leader stated, assess highly the Soviet Union's activity aimed at removing the nuclear threat from the life of present and future generations of people, ending the arms race, and settling regional conflicts, and fully support the USSR's constructive foreign policy course.

During the conversation, Hun Sen spoke of the results of his meeting with Norodom Sihanouk in Paris 2-4 December. He described it as an important political event which laid the foundations for direct dialogue between the various Cambodian sides with a view to achieving national reconciliation.

The Soviet side expressed energetic support for efforts of the PRK, the SRV, and Laos to achieve a political settlement of the Cambodian problem in the interests of the Cambodian people, peace, and security in Southeast Asia. The USSR welcomes any constructive initiatives in this direction. The meeting between the PRK head of government and N. Sihanouk is seen in the Soviet Union as a result of the course of national reconciliation proclaimed by the PRK Government and as a major success for the policy of the three Indochinese countries. This meeting brings satisfaction to all who are interested in the speediest establishment of a just and lasting peace in the ancient land of Angkor. The Soviet side welcomes the accord reached between Hun Sen and Norodom Sihanouk on continuing the dialogue. The readiness of the USSR, together with other interested countries, to continue to promote in every way the attainment of a Cambodian settlement was once again declared.

M.N. Smirnovskiy, deputy chief of a CPSU Central Committee department, and Hor Nam Hong, PRK ambassador to the USSR, were present during the talk.

More on Hun Sen-Sihanouk Talks in Paris

'Closed-Door Meeting' Held

PM031515 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Turning Point"]

[Text] Paris, 2 Dec—A meeting between Hun Sen, chairman of the PRK Council of Ministers, and Prince Norodom Sihanouk was held today in the small French town of Fere-en-Tardenois (Aisne Department). This first, "closed-door" meeting focused on the problem of national reconciliation in the light of the program put forward by the PRK Government on this issue.

The meeting was held in an atmosphere of friendship between countrymen, Hun Sen stated in a short interview with journalists. "We achieved definite results," he stressed.

The sides agreed to continue the consultations Thursday. It was also announced that the next stage of the talks will be held in Pyongyang.

It is particularly noted here that the meeting became possible thanks to the goodwill of the Indo-Chinese countries, which have been pursuing a consistent course of easing tension in Southeast Asia and resolving disputes through peaceful talks with all interested parties. The present meeting, the prestigious Paris newspaper LE MONDE stressed, can quite rightly be called historic, since it marks a turning point in settling a regional conflict that has obstructed the easing of tension in Southeast Asia for a number of years now.

The Paris press also recognizes the considerable achievements of People's Kampuchea in resurrecting the economy, developing its culture, and overcoming the consequences of Pol Pot's rule.

Hun Sen on Results

LD042329 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1753 GMT 4 Dec

[Interview with Hun Sen, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the PRK, by TASS correspondent Viktor Khrekov in Paris on 4 December]

[Text] Hun Sen, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the PRK, has commented on the results of the first consultative meeting with Prince Norodom Sihanouk, which ended today in the town of Fere-en-Tardenois, near Paris.

In a conversation with the TASS correspondent, he stated: The meeting signified an embarkation on the road to success in the process of national reconciliation. The agreement reached is the basis for seeking solutions to specific details of a political settlement to the Cambodian problem. The most important result of the current talks should be that the Cambodian issue is resolved by the Cambodian people through talks and consultations between all Cambodian sides involved in the conflict. At the same time, many specific questions of a political settlement were discussed.

In the future, the national reconciliation process could take two forms: the continuation of meetings with Prince Norodom Sihanouk. [sentence as received] Another similar meeting is already planned for January, as is the inclusion in the talks of representatives of the two Khmer organizations. However, to date, the groupings of Khieu Samphan and Son Sann do not wish to come to the negotiating table. For the moment, this is the main obstacle.

Among the specific issues discussed during the recent meeting was the problem of Cambodian refugees. Sihanouk asked us not to hamper the return of his countrymen to their homeland, and we fully agreed with him. We also guarantee all basic conditions for their normal life and work in the PRK.

All in all, stressed Hun Sen, the meeting took place in an atmosphere of friendship and fraternity between countrymen. Both sides expressed the desire to construct an independent, peaceful, and integrated Cambodia. One would like to note the important role of Norodom Sihanouk in the struggle against U.S. imperialism. He and we, too, were the victims of U.S. imperialism and the Pol Pot regime.

Fedayev Assesses Meeting

PM071609 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Yevgeniy Fadeyev "Commentator's Column": "Positive Process"]

[Text] During the last few days the world community's attention has been devoted more and more to events taking place in Southeast Asia. This is not surprising; there is an increasing realization in the region that many disputes there can and must be eradicated around the negotiating table. Moreover, the first steps have already been taken toward resolving such disputes peacefully, while taking the sides' interests into account.

A graphic example of this was the meeting in France between Hun Sen, chairman of the PRK Council of Ministers, and Prince Norodom Sihanouk. Its main content was a discussion of the national reconciliation problem in light of the program put forward by the PRK Government on this question—a program which has produced extensive interest among and positive responses from the world public.

This interest is no accident. There is now an increasing conviction that the national reconciliation policy is meant to play a decisive role in eradicating regional conflicts. Its implementation opens the way to ending senseless fratricidal wars, overcoming contradictions between different political forces and groups, and resolving urgent nationwide problems. Proclamation of the national reconciliation policy in Cambodia reflects the goodwill of the PRK leadership and its readiness to make sensible compromises for the sake of the nation's supreme interests.

In the opinion of many observers, the first meeting between Hun Sen and Norodom Sihanouk—and the sides have agreed to continue consultations—can be seen as a turning point in settling the regional conflict that has hampered the easing of tension in Southeast Asia for a number of years.

The talks held in Beijing between delegations from the foreign ministries of China and Laos also testify to an active quest for ways to bring peace and stability in the region. Agreement was reached during the talks to reestablish friendly relations and resume exchanges of ambassadors. Despite the fact that the two countries have different approaches to a number of international problems, this step—as PASASON, the organ of the Lao People's Revolutionary Party, noted—is creating an atmosphere that will promote normalizing the situation in the region.

Thus, the meetings, constructive dialogues, and search for new solutions promoting the cause of peace and security in the region and worldwide go on. This has become possible above all thanks to the goodwill shown by Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia, which are constantly striving to improve the situation in Southeast Asia. The Soviet Union is prepared, together with other interested countries, to promote the success of this positive process in every possible way.

Near East & South Asia

Mubarak Receives Cable From Soviet Leaders

NC051316 Cairo MENA in Arabic 1240 GMT 5 Dec 87

[Text] Cairo, 5 Dec (MENA)—President Muhammad Husni Mubarak has received the following cable of thanks from the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR's Supreme Soviet Presidium:

We thank you for the warm greetings and good wishes you sent on the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. We share your confidence that the

constant development of friendly relations between our two countries is in the true interests of the Soviet and Egyptian peoples and will serve to strengthen world peace and security.

Egyptian Foreign Minister on Summit, Ties

PM071240 Moscow TRUD in Russian 6 Dec 87 p 3

[Special correspondents Z. Nalbandyan, A. Repin report: "In the Interests of Security"]

[Text] Cairo, 5 Dec—In Cairo, TRUD's correspondents asked Ahmad 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, Egyptian deputy prime minister and foreign minister, to speak about the upcoming Soviet-American summit meetings and describe the present state of relations between the USSR and Egypt.

[Al-Majid] We regard the meeting of the USSR and U.S. leaders as a very important step in their efforts to ensure peace and security. We are glad to express our support for this meeting.

President H. Mubarak sent a message to M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan setting forth Egypt's position on the Washington summit meeting. We all expect questions of disarmament and other very important world problems to be discussed. We hope that the Washington talks will also promote the quest for ways to a peaceful settlement in the Near East.

As is known, Egypt advocates holding an international conference on the Near East, under UN auspices, with the participation of all interested parties and the five permanent members of the Security Council. Of course, the PLO itself will appoint its representatives to this conference, which should be based on UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. Here I would like to stress the significance we attach to the Soviet Union's role in the cause of a Near East settlement.

We are satisfied with the present state of Soviet-Egyptian relations and advocate good, friendly relations between our countries' peoples and governments. I do not think I am mistaken in saying that this desire is mutual. I sensed this during my two recent meetings with USSR Foreign Minister E. Shevardnadze. I accepted with gratitude the invitation to visit the Soviet Union. I hope this visit will be soon.

I would like to note that the volume of trade is now increasing and bilateral reciprocal ties are growing more active in various fields. We value highly the deep understanding shown by the Soviet Government in settling credit and financial questions between our countries.

In conclusion Ahmad 'Ismat 'Abd al-Majid expressed confidence that Soviet-Egyptian relations will continue to develop in the spirit of friendship and mutual respect.

USSR, PDRY Foreign Ministries Exchange Cables

PM071206 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Exchange of Telegrams"]

[Text] In connection with the 20th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and the PDRY, an exchange of telegrams took place between the foreign ministries of the USSR and the PDRY [People's Democratic Republic of Yemen].

The telegram sent by the USSR Foreign Ministry says that relations of close friendship and multifaceted, fruitful cooperation between the Soviet Union and democratic Yemen, permeated by a spirit of fraternal solidarity in the struggle for the prevention of nuclear catastrophe and the development of broad international cooperation and social progress, will continue to develop for the sake of our countries' peoples and in the interests of strengthening peace and security.

In a reply telegram PDRY Foreign Minister 'Abd al-'Aziz al-Dali noted that from the first Soviet-South Yemeni relations have acquired profound content and played a tremendous role in the life of the PDRY people and the implementation of the tasks of a national democratic revolution with a socialist perspective, in accordance with their aspirations. The determination of democratic Yemen to continue to make every effort to strengthen and develop relations of friendship and cooperation between the CPSU and the YSP [Yemeni Socialist Party] and the USSR and the PDRY was reaffirmed.

Moscow Meeting Marks Afghan Treaty Jubilee

PM071531 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Public Meeting"]

[Text] The Soviet Union is devoting great efforts to promoting the speediest achievement of a political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan, and is supporting the course of this country's government aimed at national reconciliation and the consolidation of all patriotic forces on a platform of national concord. This was stressed at a public meeting of Moscow 3 December to mark the 9th anniversary of the Treaty on Friendship, Good-neighborliness, and Cooperation between the USSR and the Republic of Afghanistan.

The speeches pointed out that the signing of this historic document was an act of traditional friendship between the two states and a consistent implementation of the peace-loving Leninist foreign policy.

M. Safi, Afghan ambassador in the USSR, talked about the changes under way in the country and about the efforts which the Afghan leadership is making with a view to creating an independent, sovereign, integral, nonaligned Afghanistan friendly to all states.

For the first time in its history, the ambassador stressed, our country has received a people's constitution in the full sense. It aims to achieve the great creative aims of the national democratic April Revolution. M. Safi expressed profound gratitude to the people of the country of the Soviets for their tremendous help and support during difficult days for Afghanistan.

Afghan Envoy Adresses Meeting

LD032145 Moscow TASS in English 1948 GMT 3 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 3 TASS—The 1978 Soviet-Afghan treaty of friendship, good neighbourhood and cooperation is a reliable legal foundation for the development of fruitful cooperation between the USSR and the Republic of Afghanistan. This thought keynoted the speeches at today's meeting devoted to the 9th anniversary with the Peoples of Foreign Countries.

"This document embodied the Leninist principles of respect for sovereignty and independence in international relations stimulated the successful development of the diverse Soviet-Afghan ties in the political, economic, cultural and scientific fields", the meeting was told by Leonid Yakubov, deputy chairman of the Board of the Soviet Society of Friendship and Cultural Ties with Afghanistan.

The meeting was addressed by the ambassador of Afghanistan in the USSR Muhammadullah Safi. He spoke highly of the 1978 treaty and specially singled out the importance of Article 4 providing for the mutual obligations of the sides in ensuring each other's security, independence and territorial integrity. When characterising the policy of national reconciliation pursued by the Afghan leadership the ambassador said that its main achievement was the creation in the country of a political system ensuring the protection of the interests of all classes and groups of the population of every nationality. "The most important characteristic of this system is its constitutional nature. Adopted at the Loya Jirgah held on November 29 and 30, the new constitution ensures the representation of the interests of all sections of Afghan society by way of a multiparty system and coalition government", the ambassador said.

Muhammadullah Safi outlined the Afghan leadership's latest initiatives in solving the problem around Afghanistan. He referred, in particular, to the possible reduction of the 12-month time frame for the withdrawal of the Soviet military contingent from that country in the event of an end to foreign interference in its internal affairs and guarantees of the non-resumption of this interference, and to an extension of the cease-fire by another six months.

Bangladesh President Dissolves Parliament

LD062014 Moscow TASS in English 1948 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] Dhaka December 6 TASS—Bangladesh President Ershad announced the dissolution of the National Assembly (parliament) late today. Bangladesh Television reported that the president had made that step in accordance with the powers under the relevant article of the country's constitution.

The president's decision came after 83 deputies from the main opposition parties, the Awami League and Jama'at-i-Islami, tendered their resignations last week to the leaders of their part groups at the parliament. According to one of the leaders, in the obtaining situation when many opposition leaders had been arrested and the president imposed a state of emergency in the country, the parliament had rendered itself completely ineffective.

Bangladesh's National Assembly has 330 seats. The ruling Jatiya Dal (National Party) has 217 seats after the 1986 elections. The next parliamentary elections were to be held in 1991. However, Ershad is considering calling early parliamentary elections.

Mass antigovernment demonstrations have been continuing in Bangladesh since November 10. At the call of the opposition, hundreds of thousands of protesters demand the immediate resignation of the government of President Ershad and the holding of new parliamentary elections, as well as the release of more than 5,000 arrested demonstrators and political prisoners. The country's public opinion blames the present administration for the acute economic crisis and low living standards in the country.

Sub-Saharan Africa

USSR-Angola Amity Society Holds Conference

PM041147 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Reports"]

[Text] The activity of the "USSR-Angola" Friendship Society is geared to implementing the policy of the CPSU and Soviet state of further strengthening all-around ties between the two countries. This was said at the society's all-union report and election conference, held in Moscow 30 November.

A new Executive Committee of the society was elected. USSR Minister of Geology Ye. A. Kozlovskiy was reelected president of the society.

The conference was attended by P. Kivila, Angolan charge d'affaires ad interim in the USSR.

USSR Delegate Addresses Arusha Conference

PM071721 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "'No' to Apartheid. Arusha Conference Ends"]

[Text] Dar es Salaam, 4 Dec—The participants in the international conference "Peoples Against Apartheid and for a Democratic Southern Africa," which ended today in the Tanzanian town of Arusha, advocated the introduction by the world community of compulsory sanctions against the apartheid regime in southern Africa and the stepping up of all-around support for the just struggle of the country's people and its vanguard—the African National Congress [ANC].

The delegates were greatly impressed by the message from M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The Soviet leader—THE DAILY NEWS government newspaper, which published the greeting, noted—expressed full and resolute support for the liberation of southern Africa. The position of the USSR is invariable: Soviet people side with the South African patriots battling for freedom and justice.

Yan Vagris, head of the Soviet delegation and deputy chairman of the USSR Supxreme Soviet Presidium, stated at the forum that the Western powers are encouraging the Pretoria racists' course of destabilizing the neighboring African states. The RSA's attempts with support from the NATO allies to halt the process of progressive transformations in Angola and Mozambique and step up economic and military pressure on Zambia and Zimbabwe, he said, are particularly alarming. The USSR, Vagris stressed, will continue to give all necessary support to the "Frontline" States in overcoming the growing pressure from the RSA.

An action program for the international public to eliminate apartheid and a declaration in support of the ANC were adopted at the closing session. These documents describe the policy of Pretoria's rulers as a crime against humanity. Apartheid, which is a system for the planned destruction of Africans, must be eliminated—that was the unanimous opinion of the forum participants.

Serious concern was expressed from the conference rostrum that the Western powers—first and foremost the United States, Britain, the FRG, and Japan—are to all intents and purposes sabotaging the adoption of effective measures against the criminal Pretoria regime. The delegates addressed a statement to the heads of state and government of the "Common Market" countries calling for comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the racist RSA. They pointed to the threatening exacerbation of the situation in southern Africa, a graphic example of which is the Pretoria regime's aggression against Angola and the suppression of the anti-apartheid movement in southern Africa.

Speaking at a press conference in Arusha, ANC Secretary General Alfred Nzo stressed the South African patriots' resolve to step up the armed struggle against the white minority government. He condemned the Western powers for their stubborn reluctance to put effective pressure on Pretoria and force it to end apartheid.

A thousands-strong demonstration of solidarity with the struggling people of southern Africa, in which conference delegates participated, was held in Arusha today.

Further on CPSU Delegation's Visit to Rwanda

Received by Habymana

PM041345 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Stay in Rwanda"]

[Text] Kigali, 2 Dec—Bonaventure Habymana, secretary general of Rwanda's ruling National Revolutionary Movement for Development (MRND) party, Tuesday received the CPSU delegation headed by N.I. Malkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Chita CPSU Obkom.

During the meeting it was noted that the CPSU and the MRND have similar views on many foreign policy questions.

The MRND secretary general expressed gratitude to the CPSU and the Soviet Government for their cooperation in training Rwandan national cadres.

Returns to Moscow 5 Dec

PM081055 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Return Home"]

[Text] The CPSU delegation headed by N.I. Malkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of the Chita CPSU Obkom, which was in the Republic of Rwanda at the invitation of the ruling party, the National Revolutionary Movement for Development, returned to Moscow 5 December.

Belyakov, CPSU Delegation Depart for Mali

PM071627 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] A CPSU delegation headed by A.M. Belyakov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Buryat CPSU Obkom, flew to Bamako 4 December in accordance with the plan for party ties between the CPSU and the Mali People's Democratic Union.

East Europe

Stoph Meets Mikulic in Berlin; Summit Noted

LD072311 Moscow TASS in English 2304 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Berlin December 7 TASS—The German Democratic Republic and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia welcome the forthcoming signing of the Soviet-U.S. treaty on the elimination of medium-and shorter-range missiles. This was stated by Willi Stoph, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the G.D.R., and Branko Mikulic, president of the Federal Executive Council of Yugoslavia, during their meeting in Berlin.

Branko Mikulic is now in the G.D.R. on an official friendly visit.

Both sides described the treaty as a historic step and made note of its importance for even more substantial future steps along the road to disarmament in all spheres, for building up trust and promoting cooperation among nations.

Joint Ventures With Bloc Firms Described

PM081009 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Joint Enterprises"]

[Text] Warsaw—A session of the Polish Government Presidium has familiarized itself with information on the creation of a Soviet-Polish joint enterprise based on Krakow's "Pollena Miraculum" perfumery. It is being set up on the basis of the agreement signed by the Soviet and Polish Governments in October last year on the fundamental principles of setting up and operating joint economic organizations. The "Pollena Miraculum" factory is an old enterprise. The plan for its reconstruction and modernization was not fulfilled in 1975-1981 owing to a shortage of funds. The creation of the joint enterprise will make it possible to complete the suspended construction, commission additional capacities, and considerably increase not only production but also the range of products.

Budapest—"Energotekhno" is the name of a new Soviet-Hungarian joint enterprise whose chief task will be to develop and produce power equipment.

"Energotekhno's" founders are, on the Hungarian side, a number of scientific research institutes, the Lenin Metallurgical Combine in the city of Miskolc, the capital's enterprise for the development of high-voltage machinery and systems, the "Industrialexport" Foreign Trade Enterprise, and the "Teknova" Industrial Development Bank; and on the Soviet side, the USSR Academy of Sciences High Temperatures Institute.

The constituent capital of the joint enterprise, located on Hungarian territory, will exceed 25 million forints, with the Soviet Union putting up 49% and Hungary 51%.

Romania's Brasov Truck Plant Difficulties

Leadership 'Sharply' Criticized

PM071211 Moscow TRUD in Russian 5 Dec 87 p 1

[TASS report: "AGERPRES on Events in Brasov"]

[Text]Bucharest, 4 Dec—The AGERPRES agency reports that an emergency general meeting of working people's representatives was held at the truck plant in Brasov city. Those taking part, the report says, sharply criticized the plant and association leadership for serious shortcomings in work and for violations of established laws and rules, which led to the nonfulfillment of plan targets and a reduction of production discipline. It was pointed out that the leadership's pernicious work methods had led to a gross violation of labor legislation and in particular to the arbitrary leveling down of incomes with no consideration for the real contribution of each worker, sector, and shop to social production.

The meeting resolved to remove the general director of the association, the plan director and deputy directors, the chairman of the working people's council, and other leaders of the enterprise from their posts.

Directors Relieved of Duties

PM081150 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 87 Second Edition p 5

[Own correspondent S. Petukhov report under the rubric "From the Socialist Countries": "The Workers Decided"]

[Text] Bucharest, 7 Dec—The central newspapers have reported a meeting of representatives of working people at the Brasov Truck Plant. It was convened at the request of the labor collective on the basis of the law on workers' self-management. The meeting, SCINTEIA writes, analyzed the activity of the enterprise's leadership, which does not come up to the proper standard, and the factors that have led in recent years to the plant's nonfulfillment of production plans and development programs, which has had a negative effect on technical and economic indicators.

The meeting concluded that the main responsibility for the grave situation that has arisen rests with the leaders of this plant—the sector's leading plant—and of the entire motor transport industrial association, who failed to take proper measures to ensure good production conditions, order, labor discipline, and violated existing legislation. The collective adopted a decision on relieving of their duties the association's general director, the plant's director and deputy directors, the chairman of the working people's council, and other leading workers

at the enterprise. At the same time, the press reports, the meeting demanded that those to blame for the disorders be expelled from the ranks of the labor collective.

West Europe

Further on Gorbachev-Thatcher Meeting in UK

Arrival Shown on Moscow TV

LD071546 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 7 Dec 87

[From the "Novosti" newscast; correspondent Shishkovskiy video report from Brize Norton air base]

[Text] We are presenting our reportage from the British air base of Brize Norton in the county of Oxfordshire, about 20 km from Oxford. The aircraft in which Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, is traveling to Washington for the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, has just landed here. [Video shows Aeroflot aircraft taxiing to end of red carpet; Mrs Thatcher, Geoffrey Howe, and entourage shown waiting]

At the invitation of the British prime minister, the Soviet leader is making a short stopover in Britain to meet and talk with Margaret Thatcher. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher; Geoffrey Howe, secretary of state for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs; and Leonid Zamyatin, USSR ambassador to Great Britain, have come to meet Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and those accompanying him.

About 300 representatives of the mass media, observers and correspondents of the major television companies, newspapers, and world news agencies have taken up their places on special stands. [video shows journalists and cameras]

The negotiations between the leaders of the Soviet Union and Great Britain, which are taking place on the eve of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, are arousing a great deal of interest. The press cites what Margaret Thatcher said about her welcoming the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and fully supporting the agreement eliminating medium- and short-range missiles that will be signed in Washington by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and President Reagan. The hope is being expressed in London, too, therefore that the present meeting between the leaders of the Soviet Union and Great Britain in Brize Norton will be a continuation of the dialogue which began in December 1984 during Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's visit to Great Britain. [Video shows Zamyatin entering aircraft; Gorbachev emerging from aircraft, followed by Raisa Gorbacheva, interpreters, others]

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev emerges from the aircraft. He is joined going down the aircraft steps by Raisa Maksimovna Gorbacheva, Comrades Shevardnadze, Yakovlev, Dobrynin, and others in the entourage.

The first handshake on British soil. Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and Geoffrey Howe warmly greet Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and exchange greetings with Raisa Maksimovna and the members of the Soviet delegation. A British schoolgirl and a Soviet schoolboy present bouquets of flowers to Raisa Maksimovna. [Video shows handshakes and flower presentation, Gorbachev and Thatcher standing to attention; Howe, Shevardnadze, Akhromeyev, Yakovlev, Dobrynin and others lined up behind]

The Soviet anthem was played by a military band. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher inspect a guard of honor of the Royal Air Force [as heard], and go toward the cars. [Video shows Gorbachev waving to crowds, getting into limousine]

The negotiations between the leaders of the two countries begin. Television cameramen and photo-reporters are given the opportunity of commemorating Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher before the start of their conversation, which is to be conducted tete-a-tete. [Video shows Thatcher and Gorbachev seated in armchairs half-facing one another]

At the same time, Comrades Shevardnadze, USSR minister of foreign affairs, will have a meeting with his British counterpart, Geoffrey Howe.

At the end of the negotiations, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher will make a statement to representatives of the mass media. [video shows long shot of the two leaders; Gorbachev says: "Just keep in mind that we have little time!", translated by interpreter]

TASS Report on Talks

LD071734 Moscow TASS in English 1711 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Brize Norton December 7 TASS—During a stopover in Britain en route to Washington Mikahil Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, met with British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher.

The meeting, which continued their long-standing dialogue, was held in a habitually frank, friendly and open manner.

Mrs. Thatcher has been following closely the processes under way in the Soviet Union and so it was only natural that the conversation started with an exchange of opinions about the progress of perestroyka, or the restructuring drive.

The interlocutors reaffirmed their conviction that the domestic changes in the Soviet Union were of great significance to both the bilateral relations of the two countries and to the international situation as a whole. Perestroyka in the economy and in terms of democratizing Soviet society makes it possible to have more and better knowledge about the intentions and affairs of each other and the world remains untroubled as a result.

Gorbachev briefly described the current phase in perestroyka, the arising economic, political and psychological difficulties, and the growing main factor that makes perestroyka irreversible—the active involvement of ever further sections of the Soviet people in the significant creative transformation of all aspects of public life.

Mrs. Thatcher reacted to Gorbachev's explanations with interest and specific comments and told him about her own experience concerning the activities of her government.

The state of trade and economic relations between the two countries was attentively discussed, with the focus being on the problems and difficulties in this field. Gorbachev accentuated the need for British projects and offers to be more competitive as this factor is continuing to result in the loss of major British orders in the Soviet Union.

Both leaders expressed confidence that there was every possibility to achieve the level of trade targetted during Mrs. Thatcher's visit to Moscow last spring. They agreed that they would be paying closest attention to the issue.

Gorbachev noted that on the whole relations between the USSR and Britain over recent years had acquired a good dynamics. The constructive position held by Mrs. Thatcher for all these years, despite the natural differences existing beween the two countries, has been very valuable and important in this process.

Mrs. Thatcher wished success to the coming Soviet-American meeting in Washington and said that both other West European leaders and she were fully in favour of the signing of the agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles. Both sides emphasised that the agreement had been not only a result of the efforts of the Soviet Union and the United States but also a result of the fact that they had acted in accord and jointly with their allies.

In this context Gorbachev emphasized Europe's role in world politics. He said that in conditions when the world was making a new turn in connection with real disarmament, with moving away from confrontation and consolidating the tendencies for cooperation the role of Europe was not only indispensable but it should be growing. No major problems could be resolved without Europe. Gorbachev assured Mrs. Thatcher that the Soviet Union would never take a step which would threaten Europe's security, infringe on its interests and cause destabilisation of the situation in Europe.

The interlocutors declared for preserving balance in the process of disarmament at its every stage on all categories of arms. Gorbachev emphasised the need for the lowering of the levels of those armaments and called on the British prime minister to intensify the efforts to determine prompter the tendency and the contents of the talks on conventional armaments with taking into account the experience accumulated during the talks on medium- and shorter-range missiles. Gorbachev said it was time to switch the talks on conventional arms from the area of propaganda to the area of policy. Let us make policy—it is precisely in this mood that I go to the talks to Washington, he said.

The parties considered the prospects for the agreement on 50-percent cuts in strategic offenvise arms. Mrs. Thatcher emphasized the extreme concern of the United States allies and her own concern with regard to the problems of verification. [Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1730 GMT on 7 December carried this report with the following addition: "...problems of verification and monitoring. Mikhail Sergeyevich..."] Gorbachev confirmed that that problem was causing the Soviet Union's concern as well. He would be strictly following the observance of the USSR's security in this respect, too.

Both sides declared for the consolidation of the ABM Treaty, for the parties not using the right to quite the treaty within agreed upon time frames. Gorbachev said that this was an important prerequisite for strategic arms reduction.

The two leaders continued an "old dispute", as Gorbachev described it, on the concept of nuclear deterrence. "You would surely agree", he said. "that it is better to be sitting in a cosy armchair than on a powder keg. When nuclear arms are banked on as a means of ensuring security, this is unacceptable in both philosophical and practical terms. There are certainly realities and we face them. But now that the process of nuclear arms reduction is about to be started, I invite you, Mrs. Prime Minister, to consider that concept of yours again".

As the issues of prohibiting chemical weapons and destroying their stocks were discussed, Gorbachev pointed out that Britain had taken an active stand in the field and made initiatives that the Soviet Union had supported. "But lately, as we see it, there has been a certain slackening off in these issues on the part of the British side," he said. Following Mrs. Thatcher's observation that the decisive role there was played by the verification problem which was very difficult, he said the

Soviet Union, too, attached much significance to the issues of verification and was prepared to discuss and solve them jointly with its partners in the talks.

In view of the forthcoming signature of a treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, Mrs Thatcher spoke about the importance of making sure that U.S. Congress would ratify it in a linkage with the issues of "human rights in the Soviet Union." A little polemic ensued, in the course of which Gorbachev reminded the prime minister about the understanding they had reached in December 1984 in Chequers that each side would run its domestic affairs itself in accordance with its legislation and avoid interfering in the affairs of the other side.

At the close of the conversation both leaders expressed satisfaction with their concentrated, even if short, exchange of opinions and agreed to continue contacts in the future as well.

Press Statements Reported

PM081032 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report under general heading "Meeting Between M.S. Gorbachev and M. Thatcher"]

[Text] Brize Norton, 7 Dec—At the end of the talks, M.S. Gorbachev and M. Thatcher made statements for the press.

M.S. Gorbachev said: "I thank you, Mrs Thatcher, first of all for your initiative for a meeting on the way to Washington. We responded to it with great interest and willingness. We regard both this brief conversation and this brief visit as convincing evidence that our dialogue, our relations are acquiring ever more dynamism and gaining a businesslike, constructive character. We are ready to continue to act in this spirit, extend and deepen our cooperation, and deepen mutual understanding. You recalled that the path to the present stage, when we have reached the point of signing the treaty—the first treaty on the elimination of two types of nuclear weapons at once—was difficult and hard, but we traversed it together. I mean the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, and our allies and your partners. I think the governments of both Western and Eastern countries, acting in this way, have expressed the will not only of their own peoples, but of the peoples of all countries, who long for peace, long for disarmament, above all nuclear disarmament, and long for a better world—a nuclear-free world.

"We expect the forthcoming visit to Washington, the conversations and talks with President Reagan and his colleagues, and the meetings with the U.S. public to deepen our dialogue with the U.S. Administration and promote progress along the path of seeking approaches to a restructuring of international relations in the spirit of more cooperation and mutual understanding.

"Thank you for the hospitality, and let me take this opportunity to convey greetings from Soviet people to the people of Great Britain and wishes for peace and happiness."

M. Thatcher said: "We have had excellent talks with Mr Gorbachev, and also with Foreign Minister Mr Shevardnadze. We warmly welcome Mr Gorbachev to our country and are delighted he found time in a very long day to make this short visit. We are living in historic times and the treaty which Mr Gorbachev is going to sign is a historic treaty. It will be a source of extra security and joy not only for the peoples of our two countries, not only for Europe and the United States, but also for the world as a whole. This treaty is the promise of more progress to come.

"We wish Mr Gorbachev and Mrs Gorbachev a very successful and happy visit to the United States."

M. Thatcher and G. Howe then said goodbye to M.S. Gorbachev, R.M. Gorbacheva, and the people accompanying them. The plane set off for Washington.

Thatcher: 'Very Good Atmosphere'

LD080221 Moscow TASS in English 0212 GMT 8 Dec 87

[Text] London December 8 TASS—Soviet-British summit talks proceeded in what Margaret Thatcher, the British prime minister, described as a "very good atmosphere."

Speaking at a news conference Monday after the meeting with Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, Mrs Thatcher said: "It has been a very great pleasure to meet Mr Gorbachev and to have a talk with Mr Gorbachev. We are, of course, on the eve of the first ever agreement between the major powers to reduce and indeed eliminate certain classes of nuclear weapons."

"I want Mr Gorbachev's summit with President Reagan to be a great success, and we welcome the INF agreement which they intend to sign," the British prime minister emphasized.

The prime minister expressed the hope that the agreement would be a step toward cutting strategic offensive, chemical and conventional arms.

"When Mr Gorbachev and I get talking, we talk certainly in quite animated debate as always. It is quite animated, but that way you get to grips with the issues very quickly," Margaret Thatcher went on.

"I found Mr Gorbachev's account, particularly of the progress of perestroyka, absolutely fascinating. He is a bold, determined and courageous leader and I hope that he succeeds in his colossal task," Mrs Thatcher said.

The British prime minister described Soviet-British relations as good. "I think that they are better than they have ever been before since Mr Gorbachev's annunciation of perestroyka and glasnost, because it is quite clear that some of the things which we believe in—greater personal initiative and personal responsibility—are also being exercised in the Soviet Union and we wish those efforts well."

I think that we are living in historic times, Margaret Thatcher emphasized. First, because of the bold initiative within the Soviet Union, but secondly, because the treaty which is about to be signed is not only a treaty to reduce nuclear weapons, but it is a promise that the very cooperation, hard work, detailed work that has enabled that to come about can also be applied further to nuclear weapons on intercontinental ballistic missiles, then to chemical and possibly conventional (weapons). So it is an indication that where there is the will, the way will be found.

At the same [as received] Mrs Thatcher said she didn't believe it was possible to achieve a nuclear weapon-free world, for, in her words, the point about nuclear weapons is that they deter and have so far prevented war in Europe.

Gorbachev Departs Britain

LD071425 Moscow TASS in English 1422 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Brize Norton, Oxfordshire, Britain December 7 TASS—Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, left here today for Washington.

Shevardnadze, Howe Hold 'Constructive' Meeting

LD071733 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Brize Norton December 7 TASS—There was also a meeting [as received] here between member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and British secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affaairs Geoffrey Howe. Topical international problems and some questions of bilateral relations were discussed during a conversation that had a constructive, business-like character. The parties noted with satisfaction that following the Soviet-British summit last March in Moscow, a political dialogue, contacts and mutually advantageous cooperation of the two countries in various areas had become more dynamic, assumed effective and systematic nature. It was agreed that a thorough exchange of opinions would be continued during Geoffrey Howe's coming visit to the Soviet Union early next year.

Prospects for Soviet, British Relations Viewed

LD072223 Moscow in English to Great Britain and Ireland 2000 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Interview with Radio Moscow's Yuriy Minayev and Nikolay Borin by unidentified Moscow radio announcer—date and place not given]

[Text] [Announcer] In an interview for ITV [Independent Television] the British prime minister has outlined her priorities, saying it is not a nuclear-free Europe that we seek; it is a war-free Europe, as General Galvin said. And of course, the main way of keeping a war free Europe is a nuclear deterrent.

Today Mrs Thatcher again repeated her views that nuclear weapons do deter war and cannot be disinvented. Let us listen now to the response of Radio Moscow's Yuriy Minayev to the question: What do you think about the idea of Britain's independent nuclear deterrent in the present conditions?

[Minayev] It is now traditional for many Western politicians to base their policies on a worst-case scenario. This approach is considered the most realistic. However, I, for one, do not think so. If our every day life were based on the possible harm one person could do to another, our lives would surely be unbearable. We would see a robber or a murderer in every passer by, (?that is) an absurd situation.

Nevertheless such a policy has, for some reason, been adopted by the West in its relations with the East. I think that it is high time for East-West relations to be built on a realistic analysis of intentions, not on the ability to inflict harm on somebody.

[Announcer] Do you think that sooner or later Britain will feel compelled to negotiate on its nuclear arsenal?

[Minayev] Even now London's attitude to this problem arouses serious controversy. The British Government wants to influence negotiations, but at the same time it does not want to negotiate. I believe that, at some time in the future, after the Soviet Union and the United States have scrapped part of their strategic nuclear arsenals, Britain will have to decide whether it is for or against nuclear disarmament. Mikhail Gorbachev said today that the road to the INF treaty had not been as easy one, but, he added, we have covered this road together; I mean all together, the Soviet Union and the United States, Great Britain, our allies and your partners. These words, in my opinion, express appreciation of the role Great Britain has played in helping to bring about the Soviet-American treaty. But they also, I think, reflect a hope for future actions on Great Britain's part, too, to rid the world of nuclear weapons.

[Announcer] Many Western leaders in Europe still appear to have certain doubts about removing American missiles from Europe. How do you explain this?

[Minayev] The point is that the United States is now prodding its allies to assume a greater burden of military expenditure, and along with the first signs of disarmament, new types of arms are being developed. If the INF treaty is signed, according to NATO strategists, a certain gap will appear in Western defense. Accordingly, the Americans are calling for additional military expenditures by the European NATO countries. Furthermore, some military, and not only military, leaders, have accustomed [as heard] to the idea of a nuclear deterrent, and it is rather hard for them to part with it. To some extent, it is even impossible for them to see their countries nuclear-free. But, as Oscar Wilde once said, nothing is worth doing except what the world says is impossible. A nuclear free world is a must of the times, and I hope this idea will win worldwide acceptance.

[Announcer] Thank you, Yuriy Minayev. There appears to be a certain difference between the American and the British approach to the "Star Wars" project. Sir Geoffrey Howe, the British foreign secretary, today confirmed that any researching in this field should be carried out within the framework of the ABM Treaty. I am asking Nikolay Borin whether Washington will come around to this posture on SDI?

[Borin] Well unfortunately, the latest reports do not support such hopes. The organization responsible for the SDI program is planning to create a new type of American spaceship to put a new combat laser, Zenith Star, in orbit. These plans seem to bear out the President's statement that the United States, would research and develop, and when it was ready, would deploy space weapons. If that is so, we would witness SDI becoming a serious stumbling block on the way to reducing strategic nuclear missiles. As for the British position, I can only add that any antimissile systems deployed in outer space would immediately reduce to nought the very idea of British nuclear deterrence. This is certainly obvious to Dr David Owen, who said as much to the Soviet magazine NEW TIMES in a recent interview.

Further on Ligachev's Activities in France

'Numerous Meetings' Held

PM081039 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[Own correspondent V. Bolshakov and TASS correspondent Yu. Lopatin dispatch: "The Voice of French Workers. At the 26th PCF Congress"]

[Excerpts] Paris, 5 Dec—The 26th French Communist Party Congress continues its work. [passage omitted]

Numerous meetings have been held with the framework of the congress between the CPSU delegation headed by Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and delegations of fraternal communist and workers parties and national liberation movements attending the French communists' forum. [passage omitted]

Paris News Conference Held

PM071557 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Press Conference in Paris"]

[Excerpt] Paris, 5 Dec—A press conference by the CPSU Central Committee delegation attending the French Communist Party [PCF] Congress has been held in Paris. Delegation head Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, said in his introductory speech:

I do not think it necessary to make an extensive statement. You would, I imagine, agree that it would be preferable to leave more time to answer your questions. Thus I will make just a few remarks regarding my own and my comrades' impressions of our stay in France, or rather in Paris.

As you know, our delegation was invited to the 26th PCF Congress. We gratefully responded to this invitation.

What can be said about the work of the congress? The last 3 days of its work were filled with a profound and varied discussion on the substantive report by PCF Secretary General Comrade Georges Marchais. For us representatives of the CPSU, it is interesting and instructive to participate in our French comrades' congress.

There can be no argument that Soviet and French Communists are tackling the solution of different problems. Our histories are different, and we act in an independent and sovereign fashion. Nonetheless, we are far from indifferent to each other's experience. Mutual interpretation of experience in no way assumes some sort of copying. But, as M.S. Gorbachev has said on many occasions, it is one of the most valuable sources for the enrichment of Marxist-Leninist thinking.

In addition to this, communists share a common task—the struggle for peace, social progress, and international cooperation. Here we and the French Communists are marching along the same path toward a safe and nuclear-free world.

Our attention was drawn by the fact that the congress confirmed the PCF's stance in favor of peace, nuclear disarmament, and security, in favor of a constructive contribution by France to the disarmament process. We value the support given by French Communists to the Soviet initiatives on questions of peace and disarmament.

We exchanged opinions on all these questions in a friendly conversation with Comrades G. Marchais, A. Lajoinie, and other members of the PCF Politburo.

As you know, during our stay in Paris, we had meetings with French President Francois Mitterrand, French Prime Minister Jacques Chirac, and Mr R. Barre. We perceive these contacts in the context of continuing and deepening Soviet-French political dialogue, improving mutual understanding with France in the interests of our countries' peoples, and strengthening peace and cooperation in Europe and all over the world.

A personal message from M.S. Gorbachev was presented to the president. The core of the conversations which followed was the common understanding that the world is now living on the eve of an international event that is important by even the most exacting standards of history. It is now on the threshold of a qualitatively new crucial stage that demands profound awareness and an appropriate mode of action. This is why the discussion centered on the prospects of strengthening European and international security, Europe's future, and the role and position of Soviet-French dialogue and cooperation.

We are prepared to most attentively consider the specific features of French politics. For our part, we hope that political decisions made and defense programs adopted in France will be oriented toward strengthening of security not through the modernization and buildup of arms but on the basis of a considerable reduction of the level of armaments without detriment to anyone's security.

I guess that you will ask me questions about restructuring. I have already touched on this subject in my speech at the PCF congress. This is why I will be brief.

Restructuring is a process of improving and strengthening socialism. Our country has built up an enormous potential in the 70 years since our revolution. Now we are setting it in motion. The process of society's revolutionary renewal has already embraced all aspects of life, the economy, politics, and the social and spiritual spheres. Its dominant feature is man, his interests, and the release and development of his energy and abilities, creative, intellectual, and moral. For this purpose we are developing the democratization of society, glasnost, and the people's self-management. For this same purpose, we are implementing radical economic reform. Furthermore, all the measures being taken, from restructuring of the production management system to changes in the price formation system, will be implemented not only without any detrimental effect on people but also, and ultimately, for the sake of improving their lives.

It was not so long ago—2 and 1/2 years—that the CPSU laid down the strategic line of restructuring and acceleration at the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum. We have not been successful in everything, we have experienced both difficulties and failures. But clearly visible progress can be noticed everywhere, along all avenues. The moral atmosphere in society is changing decisively, and the dynamism of the country's economic and social development is growing.

We are aware of our responsibility to ourselves, to our people, and to the whole world. The results, the good results of restructuring will pile up, whether in domestic or international affairs.

Ye.K. Ligachev and V.V. Zagladin replied to numerous questions by journalists. [passage omitted]

More on Paris News Conference

PM071246 Paris LE MONDE in French 6-7 Dec 87 p 3

["A.J." report: "Mr Ligachev's Caution and Irritation"]

[Text] The press conference held at the USSR Embassy in Paris on the evening of Friday 4 November did not give Yegor Ligachev the opportunity to "make a hit" with the Western press. He described the report which [French Communist Party Secretary General] Mr Marchais delivered to the 26th French Communist Party Congress as "rich in substance," but he was reluctant to place too much emphasis on the internal affairs of a party which must "determine its own policy"—and this may explain why there was more talk about its fight for disarmament than about its internal debates.

In general, Mr Ligachev's remarks, at least on this occasion, were reminiscent of those made by TASS or PRAVDA commentators on their cautious days.

There was only one hint of humor. Asked whether he is really the regime's "second leader," he replied by saying "what Comrade Ligachev thinks of that." But he said that he is just "one of the secretaries," with his "own responsibilities," and his "frame of reference," and that, in any case, the Politburo is "a very coherent body, all of whose members are on the same wavelength."

There were also two slight signs of irritation. Would the USSR intervene in Romania as it did in Czechoslovakia if Mr Ceausescu's regime was seriously threatened?

[Ligachev] We hope that our Romanian comrades will overcome their problems as quickly as possible. There is no reason to answer the question differently. We have never attacked anybody. [Ligachev ends]

With regard to Trotskiy, Mr Ligachev did not like being asked whether the Red Army's founder was assassinated on Stalin's orders. Moreover, the latter was a "contradictory figure" who canot be described "in black and white" terms.

The rest was all about peace and cooperation among peoples. The journalists were urged to cooperate in establishing this new climate. One day the European leaders will have to accept this rationale, in other words

will have "to tackle the problem of nuclear disarmament" on their continent. But, Mr Ligachev said he did not go into details on this point in his talks with Prime Minister Jacques Chirac, President Mitterrand, and Mr Barre.

Departs Paris for Moscow 6 Dec

PM071553 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 87 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Return to Moscow"]

[Text] Paris, 6 Dec—Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who headed a CPSU delegation to the 26th French Communist Party [PCF] Congress, left for Moscow today.

He was accompanied to the airport by M. Gremetz, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PCF Central Committee, J. Laloe, mayor of Ivry-sur-Seine, and others. Those present included Ya.P. Ryabov, Soviet ambassador to France.

Ye.K. Ligachev was met at the airport in Moscow by L.N. Zaykov, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretary of Moscow CPSU Gorkom, and other officials. Those present included Yves Pagniez, French ambassador to the USSR.

More on French Communist Party Congress

Marchais Delivers Report 2 Dec

PM041321 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[PRAVDA correspondent and TASS Report: "26th French Communist Party Congress; Comrade Georges Marchais' Report"]

[Text] Paris, 2 Dec—The regular 26th Congress of the French Communist Party [PCF] opened today in the sports center of Saint-Ouen, a workers' suburb of Paris. Above the presidium was an enormous banner bearing the slogan "Struggle, cohesion, a strong communist party for justice, freedom and peace!" The more than 1,700 delegates to the congress are to discuss and adopt the new PCF program, determine the party's tactics and strategy for the next few years, and in particular with the presidential elections in spring next year, and elect a new composition for its leading organs.

Taking part in the work of the French Communists' supreme forum are representatives of 116 fraternal communist and workers parties, national liberation movements, and other progressive organizations. The CPSU Central Committee delegation is headed by Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

PCF General Secretary G. Marchais delivered a report at the congress today.

We are living in an era of revolutions, transformations, and profound upheavals, he said. Everywhere a reevaluation of former ideas is under way and unprecedented opportunities are being opened up. Some of these changes are of a lightning nature. Human knowledge is pushing back horizons. The ideal of a world without weapons can be turned from utopia into reality. New means are appearing capable of ensuring all peoples' right to development. Socialism is being revolutionized in order to become socialism to an even greater extent. A new era is thus opening in history when man is gradually acquiring the opportunity to meet his colossal requirements and take his fate into his own hands. A great liberation movement is leading man forward to a higher degree of civilization.

It is now possible, the speaker continued, not only to put an end forever to the age-old fear of hunger, poverty, and epidemics. Conditions are also being created for the true liberation and progress of all mankind. But it is essential that the impressive means available should not be diverted from their liberating goals. They must not be used against man, for his even greater enslavement, for superexploitation, oppression, and the stockpiling of increasingly lethal types of weapons.

Do you have to be a pessimist in this regard? Let us take a look at the facts. Next week M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan, in accordance with the accord they have reached, will conclude an agreement on eliminating all medium-range and shorter-range nuclear missiles. This agreement has been specially conceived to lay the foundation to the process of eliminating all types of nuclear weapons, the process of universal disarmament. For the first time in history, the world's two mightiest powers will thus begin to destroy some of the most terrible categories of weapons they possess. Arms agreements have been concluded in the past, but on each occasion it was a question of limiting a particular type of weapon, which did not prevent development of other types. But now it is a case of something quite different: of eliminating and destroying existing armaments. An opportunity is thus opened up for implementing people's age-old dream of a life under conditions of security and peace. Henceforth this dream becomes reality.

This important new fact is the result of an understanding of the nature of a fundamental question put before mankind and of the simple, terrible alternative: either disarmament, or the annihilation of the human race. So many nuclear weapons have already been stockpiled that the use of just one-tenth of these stockpiles would plunge our entire planet into a terrible nuclear winter, and mankind would no longer be able to recover.

As this danger grew, G. Marchais noted, the demand for disarmament became increasingly widespread among world public opinion. Despite the propaganda of the

champions of the arms race, their thesis of the fatal inevitability of the "balance of fear" and of the need to have a defense for all time in the form of nuclear weapons had to retreat. An enormous movement came into play, attracting to the struggle countless numbers of eminent figures and organizations adhering to the most diverse political movements, views, and faiths. This movement is also strengthening in France. We are glad that in this field, as in others, our party has played a vanguard role.

The states which support disarmament have come out with numerous initiatives. The nonaligned countries' contribution was also considerable. The socialist countries—the Warsaw Pact states—and China have played and continue to play a most important part in this process, as of course does the Soviet Union and its dynamic actions aimed at achieving a real end to the lethal race. A real plan for universal, full, and verifiable nuclear disarmament has been put forward. It is accompanied by proposals of determining significance like the prevention of militarization of space and international cooperation in its peaceful use, freezing and prohibition of nuclear tests, nonproliferation of nuclear weapons, creation of nuclear-free zones and peace zones, prohibition of all types of chemical weapons, prohibition of new types of weapons of mass annihilation, and reduction of conventional armaments and armed forces. On all these items, the Soviet Union has put forward specific proposals with dates and figures. Henceforth a door is open to an era of peace, and attainment of the goal of "zero nuclear weapons in the year 2000" is possible.

All this opens up impressive new opportunities, the PCF general secretary stressed. On the immediate plane, this can only promote the peaceful settlement of conflicts bearing grief and death to so many peoples in Central America and the Near and Far East. But let us take a look at things even more broadly. Elimination of a dominant factor of international relations like superarmament within the framework of the "balance of fear" makes it possible to build these relations on an utterly new basis. Disarmament is the only way out, enabling mankind not only to survive and save itself from death but also to restructure international relations on a positive plane and to change the approach toward solving problems of our time.

After all, there are 556 soldiers and only 85 doctors for every 100,000 inhabitants of our planet. It is essential, and it is becoming possible, to change this senseless logic! At present 800 million people, a further 40 million are added to their number every year, suffer from famine and malnutrition. Every year, several tens of millions of people, half of them children, die as a result. There are 1 billion men and women living in total poverty. The possibility of putting an end to this situation is inextricably linked with disarmament. It is impossible to finance arms and development simultaneously. Transferring to the satisfaction of the peoples' needs colossal funds now fruitlessly spent on the arms race is a truly vital necessity. That is why we suggest that 10% of military expenses be deducted right now, immediately, into a development fund controlled by the United Nations.

We do not conceal the fact: For this it is necessary that new relations of cooperation and friendship, i.e. what we call a new world economic order, should replace imperialist relations of plunder and domination.

In particular, it is essential to review the entire system of international financial relations, to put an end to the stifling rule of the IMF, the dollar, the yen, and the mark. This is in the interests of the peoples of developing countries and capitalist countries because not a single people gains from measures suppressing other peoples. The former and the latter are both interested in developing cooperation in accordance with their requirements.

The actions of the forces already existing, demanding justice, freedom, and peace, are essential for these changes. Today there already exists a social system which has proven its superiority: socialism. Quite recently, just a few years ago, it seemed that socialism had lost its historical initiative in the eyes of millions of people, including in France. But the situation has now changed radically. All progressive forces, and above all the Communists, are following with tremendous interest and hope the profound changes taking place in the socialist countries, particularly in the Soviet Union.

The substance of these changes, of which the CPSU has acted as the initiator, permits no ambiguous interpretation. "The revolution continues"—those are the words of M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

Having put an end to man's exploitation of man, socialism, which but for a few exceptions has been built only in underdeveloped countries, has already proven its ability to resolve very important problems like hunger, poverty, unemployment, social security, illiteracy, and its ability to develop education, sport, and culture. The Soviet Union and other socialist countries use all advantages of socialism to resolve today's problems, making tremendous efforts for renewal. The restructuring under way in the USSR is affecting virtually all spheres of economic, social, political, and cultural life.

The process of changes in the Soviet Union, the aim of which is the fullest satisfaction of Soviet people's requirements, is striking in terms of its depth and rapidity and magnitude of the tasks it has set. Is it possible to ensure its irreversibility? Soviet Communists reply confidently: Yes. This confidence has every justification because it rests on democracy, on the most active participation of all Soviet people in this process.

We find in these transformations ideas which are close to us: to wit, priority for satisfaction of working people's social needs, justice and social progress, economic efficiency, the development of democracy, and peace, G. Marchais stated. Inasmuch as that is our conception of socialism, we have irrevocably denounced the serious, monstrous distortion of socialism that was Stalinism.

Within the framework of our conception during the seventies and eighties, we have made criticisms and expressed concern over what was happening in some socialist countries, in particular in the fields of economic and social policy and in observance of human rights. For the sake of this conception of socialism, we fully support the process taking place in the Soviet Union.

The situation in the socialist countries has been the focus of lively discussion at all our party's recent congresses, G. Marchais pointed out. We have defined our principled position: Each people building a socialist society has the right to choose its own path for attaining this goal, and we do not intend to interfere in other people's affairs or, of course, to teach lessons to other people. At the same time, we are in solidarity with all peoples who have chosen the path of building a socialist society.

The PCF general secretary dwelled in detail on topical problems of the world today. At present, he noted, a large proportion of mankind continues to live under conditions of poverty and is experiencing veritable calamities. Militarism and capitalism's unrestrained attempts to impose its rule also remain a reality. The causes of evil and of the crimes which are committed lie by no means in man's nature but in the actual character of the system which keeps part of mankind in its clutches—capitalism.

The arms race is essentially an age-old necessity for capitalism's existence. Above all, capitalism needs armed forces to preserve its rule. Of course, the times have already passed when it could freely impose its will on the whole world through the notorious "gunboat policy." But relapses of this policy can be observed to this day, and capitalism unhesitatingly embarks on armed intervention. That was the case in 1983, when U.S. Marines landed in Grenada, in 1982 when the war in the Malvinas erupted, and in 1986, when a raid against Libya was undertaken, and this year, when a U.S. naval armada entered the Persian Gulf. Such actions are also characteristic of France, as is borne out by the French military presence in Chad and in the Persian Gulf region and by the acts of subversion by the French special services against the ship belonging to the Greenpeace environmental protection organization. On all continents, military presence or military operations conducted by the United States and also by France, Britain, Israel, and the RSA are the most powerful pressure on the peoples and states striving to rid themselves of imperialist dominion.

Acts of direct armed intervention are far from the sole manifestation of the policy of negotiating from a position of strength. Interference in the peoples' internal affairs is one of the most characteristic features of the capitalist countries and, above all, of the United States. The United States sends enormous sums of money and military advisers to render aid to its vassal states and, in particular, to fascist dictatorships and counterrevolutionary movements such as the Nicaraguan contras, for instance. Today, as yesterday, military might, violence, and war are for the forces of capital the essential guarantees of conservation of its power.

For capitalism, the speaker stressed, militarism is not only a political necessity but is also dictated by financial considerations. The profits obtained in this area are reckoned in astronomical sums. The inflation of military budgets is today one of the main means with which capitalist powers are trying to achieve a technological advantage. This policy is generating acute contradictions within the capitalist economy itself and is one of the main reasons for the state budgets' deficits. At the same time, it is weakening the production base of capitalism. Experience shows that countries developing high technology in the civilian field are in a better position than those giving priority to military development.

The course toward economic militarization was also graphically manifested in the notorious "Star Wars" program put forward by the U.S. Government, which considerably increases the burden of military expenditure. If this senseless project becomes reality, space will be virtually larded with nuclear missiles ready to be put into operation automatically within fractions of a second. A veritable lethal canopy will loom over our planet. A catastrophe ready to erupt at any minute will be programmed.

To make possible the implementation of the program for space militarization, the United States is bringing pressure to bear on the West European countries in order to force them to reorient their state scientific research and activity of high-technology enterprises. At the same time, the United States is trying to impose the modernization of conventional armaments and the formation of supranational military forces.

It is essential to note in particular, G. Marchais pointed out, that the French leaders are far from resisting this pressure. Thus in France, over 40% of state appropriations for the needs of science and two-third of the state's capital investments are linked with the military sphere. The law on military programs for the forthcoming 5 years recently approved by all French political parties, except the PCF, provides for allocation of military appropriations to the sum of about Fr500 billion.

This largely explains the desire of the leading capitalist states to do everything possible to impede any real initiative aimed at disarmament and to block this process. But they have nonetheless now been obliged to

consider the demand of the time—the universal demand for disarmament. For the first time in the entire history of its rule, the capitalist class has been faced with the prospect of being obliged to ensure conservation of its power and growth of profits in the context of disarmament.

It is this feature which can be clearly discerned in the French leaders' present policy. What are they seeking now? By no means basing themselves on the first step of real disarmament in order to contribute to expansion of this process. On the contrary, an attempt is being made to compensate for the withdrawal of U.S. missiles by a new intensification of French military might within the framework of NATO strategy. This senseless policy is on the one hand mingled with aggressiveness and on the other is leading to the undermining of our country's authority. The use of French nuclear weapons will be subject also to the will of, for instance, the West German chancellor. The Paris-Bonn axis, which is to become the European basis of the NATO alliance, can already be clearly discerned.

The capitalist countries have now again entered a period of profound crisis, the speaker continued. The desire to seize foreign sales markets is provoking veritable trade wars. As in every war, there are vanquished and victors here. All these upheavals, in particular, the recent stock market slump, are reflected above all in the position of the peoples. Suffice it to say that in West Europe, 23 million people live below the poverty line. There are 17 million unemployed in the EEC.

Nor has the crisis bypassed France, the PCF general secretary stressed. A general recession has today become a reality. To safeguard its profits, the bourgeoisie is resorting to a toughening of the exploitation of the working people. Alongside the enrichment of big capital, inequality is being intensified and the working masses' economic position is deteriorating. In France today, over 3.5 million people are out of work. Of these over 0.5 million have been unemployed for over 2 years, and 3.5 million people receive a miserly wage.

The universal offensive on basic rights and democratic freedoms has acquired special scope under present-day conditions. Lack of rights, police reprisals, and violence are concealed behind the facade of the widely billed "just state." Repressions at enterprises against Communists and trade union activists have assumed unprecedented dimensions.

But the situation is by no means hopeless. Justice and peace must become reality for mankind. Today a hard, complicated, ordeal-laden struggle against an enemy having no intention of surrendering his positions is the only way for France to emerge from the crisis, the only way to make the fullest use of all our country's potential.

The clash between the forces of the past and the forces promoting the birth of a new world is a feature of the forthcoming period, the PCF general secretary then said. But in France, capital is seeking to ensure that the people do not know of this struggle, do not know of the class essence of the ruling circles' present course, of the possibility of pursuing a different policy, of the fact that capitalism in crisis is not the only possible system. The grande bourgeoisie has great potential for censoring and concealing realities. It is above all a case of television, which for many people in our country has become virtually the sole source of information. The gulf between reality and its portrayal on the television screen is constantly growing. In its manipulation of awareness, the ruling class can also count on the country's main political parties, primarily the right-wing and extreme right-wing parties. As for the Socialist Party, it is also joining these efforts to recarve the country's political life. But the Socialist Party is not among the right-wing forces. Rank-and-file socialists do not support the ideas of the right-wingers but, on the contrary, share with the Communists many progressive values and are struggling against the conservatives and extreme right.

Dwelling on recent experience of the rule of the left-wing forces, G. Marchais admitted that this course was erroneous in that it weakened the popular movement, subordinating its development to the interests of the election struggle. This caused profound disillusionment.

The PCF remains the party of the working class, he continued, and it will always do battle with the forces of capital inasmuch as the working people's class interests are incompatible with interests of the grande bourgeoisie. The future belongs to the working class. It is playing a key role, is interested in thwarting the policy of capital, and bears the possibility of resolving real problems facing the country.

Aware of the threats which the policy of capital entails to our people and of the opportunities which exist for building a future based on justice, freedom, and peace, the PCF suggests rallying around a real prospect—an alliance for struggling against the grande bourgeoisie and for changing policy, power, and society. At our previous congress, we formulated the idea of creating an alliance of the majority of the people, which will make it possible to overcome the present difficulties and which will force the adversary to retreat and seek changes. This proposal also accords with the tasks of the present day inasmuch as it makes it possible to unite broad strata of the population irrespective of the political blocs which existed in the past.

The policy of capital is striking against the interests of the overwhelming majority of the population and is facilitating the possibility of creating an alliance of the majority of the people. But this cannot happen automatically when you take account of the feelings of despair, demoralization, and passive assent to the elimination of many gains which spread during the period of crisis.

Under these conditions, the party is required to make considerable efforts, to consider all demands of the people's masses, to take part in honest dialogue, and to elaborate proposals for resolving specific problems. In this movement, the supporters of other parties can also support the Communists in the struggle.

The PCF is fully determined to do everything to change the present situation and to open up opportunities for changes. That is how it differs from other social and political parties and in particular from the Socialist Party, whose activity is now far removed from its 1981 activity. Touching further on the actions of P. Juquin, who recently stood as candidate for the presidential elections against the PCF candidate and was expelled from the party for doing so, G. Marchais noted that this figure's proposals have something in common with the proposals of class social democracy. They consist in considering the people's aspirations without, however, indicating the class content of the changes necessary for their implementation and thus dooming the struggle for changes to defeat.

Our party's struggle, he continued, inextricably combines protest against the policy of capital with the movement for profound changes. Our tasks include primarily the defense of those who are the victims of the policy of capital. The Communists have always been in the front ranks of the fighters for the interests of the working people and the exploited. Opportunities for achieving major successes exist in this field. The PCF is primarily the party of the working class, which is becoming the victim of the offensive of businessmen, the deterioration of working conditions, and the decline of the living standard. But we also address employees, young people, students, immigrants, women, the intelligentsia, small and middle peasants, artisans and traders. These categories of the population are suffering from the present course to varying degrees, but the course is striking against them all.

In the prevailing situation, we believe that only unity in the struggle against the policy of capital can create conditions for changes that the Communists advocate. For the victory of this movement, it is essential that a different correlation of forces take shape in the country. If the people's forces allow themselves to be split and if they retreat, capital will continue to impose its will. But if the champions of changes rally together, they will force their adversaries to retreat. Citing a number of recent examples confirming the great potential of the people's movement, G. Marchais said that whenever this movement is broad enough and resolute enough it can compel its adversaries to retreat.

The speaker then dwelled on the question of the fields [as published], which should be encompassed by changes advocated by French Communists. He stressed that it is essential to achieve a change in the policy which has been pursued for the past 20 years and which has led to the present crisis. It is necessary to seek a change of power inasmuch as the country's present leadership is inextricably linked with the forces of capital. A change in society is needed because the present crisis is a crisis of the system of capitalism itself. It is essential to build a democratic, self-administered society, socialism in the French manner, through democratic means, the PCF leader said.

Since 1976, he continued, each party congress has deepened the content which we invest in the project of society which we develop. The 25th congress specified that we are struggling for a just society that ensures universal employment, economic growth on the basis of sztisfying the population's requirements, expansion of freedom and democracy, use of scientific and technical progress in the interests of man, flowering of culture and creation, and establishment of new relations between people. But the party must continue to work on deepening the concept of the society it wants for France.

A change in the political line is impossible without a change in the class in power. It is a case of establishing through universal ballot political democracy, a representative people's power enabling the working class to exercise a leading role. The PCF is prepared to assume any responsibility for this democratization of the country's life and creation of a majority and a government capable of pursuing the new policy.

Our party does not believe it will be able to achieve these changes alone. But we are prepared to conclude agreements with other political forces, including the socialists, and to assume part of the responsibility for managing state affairs. The PCF is prepared to continue to cooperate with other forces in local organs of power when this helps to resolve the problems facing the working people.

We suggest a way out of the present deadlock that is the continuation—whether by the right-wing forces or by the socialists—of the present policy. We suggest a search for new solutions through creating an alliance of popular forces for joint rule for the sake of changes. But we are still a long way from implementing this task as long as the majority in France belongs to the right-wing forces and as long as the Socialist Party is not seeking changes or attainment of an alliance of popular forces but, on the contrary, is advocating continuation of the present policy in alliance with some rightwingers.

That is why changes are possible only as a result of a substantial change in the correlation of political forces, which is impossible without the growth of the PCF's influence.

Touching on the draft of the party's new program to be approved at the present congress, G. Marchais stressed that for several months now the Communists have been discussing this document's clauses. During the debate which developed, several thousand amendments were made to the draft document. The draft of the new program, he said, may be summed up as follows: justice,

freedom, and peace. In contrast to other program documents of the PCF, this draft does not provide for any compromises with other political forces. But it can perfectly well serve as the basis for preparing a government program.

Having given a detailed account of the proposals put forward by the Communists and aimed at resolving the country's economic and social problems, G. Marchais noted that the new PCF program outlines a course which has nothing in common with the policy now being implemented in the country. This policy is leading to an aggravation of the problems of poverty and unemployment, is resulting in new deprivations for broad strata of the population, and is causing mounting alarm for their future among young people, is aimed at the superexploitation of the working people, and signifies further economic recession. It is the solution of all these problems which the policy of social justice outlined by the Communists is designed to promote.

The finances necessary for implementing this policy, G. Marchais stressed, can be obtained through the democratic reform of the taxation system which the Communists have elaborated. The PCF general secretary also pointed to the need to take steps to boost leading and advanced sectors of French industry and to further develop the services sphere and agriculture. The Communists put forward specific proposals which should promote development of industry and which would make it possible to remove the economy from the control of capital. They provide for expansion of the state sector of the economy, introduction of strict control over distribution of capital investments, development of France's economic cooperation with other capitalist countries on the basis of a more balanced trade exchange, and expansion of ties with the socialist and developing states.

Analyzing then the problems of the EEC and relations between the European countries, G. Marchais noted: Now that an opportunity has appeared for beginning a truly historic stage of the process of disarmament and cooperation on our continent, we propose a new prospect—a Europe without an "iron curtain," without "cold wars." He stressed that favorable conditions have now formed in Europe for expanding economic and cultural cooperation and for resolving fundamental problems like arms reduction, environmental conservation, and space development.

The report summed up results of the discussion in the party organizations of the section of the party program defining the PCF's tasks in the human rights struggle. The Communists, G. Marchais said, have achieved success in defending civil liberties and human rights. They have always held advanced poositions on this sector, but in the past 10 years the class enemy has been able to advance on this salient and at a certain stage was even able to paralyze the working people's movement. Today, the speaker said, we are seizing back the initiative. It is perfectly6 obvious that the present development of the international situation creates favorable conditions for our struggle for freedom. It will be no exaggeration to say that a breakthrough has now emerged in the ideological struggle under way in this field.

Going on to describe France's military policy, G. Marchais noted: Despite the demands of the population of Polynesia and the countries of the South Pacific, France is continuing nuclear weapons tests, developing even more monstrous types of arms which have nothing in common with ensuring national security. It has been decided to effect a considerable new increase to military appropriations, which are being built up at the expense of other budget items. The former strategy, which provided for the repulsion of any act of aggression wherever it came from, has now been rejected: The adversary—the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries—has now been directly named. Paris is now openly speaking of the possibility of delivering a first nuclear strike.

Under these conditions, G. Marchais continued, the PCF's course toward preserving the French nuclear potential at a specified level already means in practice a considerable and immediate reduction of nuclear armaments and the winding up of all programs now initiated for building them up.

It is not a case of France's unilateral disarmament, especially as no one is demanding it. The main problem is that France should actively promote the process of universel disarmament while retaining its independence. That is what we are proposing.

The PCF general secretary dwelled in detail on preparation for the presidential elections to be held in the country in the spring of next year. Big capital, he said, is counting on using these elections to implement the so-called "modernization" of French political life, i.e. to ensure a new distribution of forces, making it possible in any circumstances to form a majority supporting the "economic stringency" policy. That is why the role which big capital has already assigned to the new president consists in overcoming, after the election, France's traditional watershed between right and left forces and concluding an alliance with representatives of the other camp. In connection with the present election campaign, the speaker noted, big capital is also nurturing plans aimed at further weakening the PCF's positions. That is why attacks on the PCF's activity occupy a very important place in the propaganda campaign mounted by the forces of capital. It constantly uses all means for influencing public opinion—television, radio, the press. With the exception of the period of Hitler's occupation, it may be said that there has never been such an anticommunist campaign in France.

A veritable persecution of Communists is developing in the country, and dismissals and legal persecutions are

continuing against PCF activists who take part in working people's demonstrations for their rights. PCF representatives in local organs of power are receiving monstrous court sentences for firmly defending their electorate's interests.

Touching next on the PCF's preparation for the presidential election, G. Marchais stressed that the Communists' candidate—Andre Lajoinie, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PCF Central Committee—has begun his election campaign successfully. What is needed now is the further mobilization of all Communists for the preparation for elections and expansion of the party organizations' work in explaining the PCF's election campaign. The Communists' candidate must become the candidate of all those who want to open a new path toward the unity of the forces seeking changes.

The PCF, the speaker continued, is a modern party because it is the party of forces creating the future, the party of the working class. It always reflects the aspirations of society's living forces: workers, peasants, creative workers, and young people. In its activity, it is guided by revolutionary theory, Marxism, and scientific socialism. Marxism and modernity are indivisible concepts. In modern society, on which the theories of the "death of ideologies" are being imposed, Marxism acquires special significance. It is present reality which confirms the vitality of Marxism: Capitalism is entering the stage of its latest crisis while socialism, on the other hand, is renewing its advance under the slogan "More socialism." It is not dogma but reality itself which confirms the main provision of scientific socialism: Capitalism is a historically transitional form while socialism is a higher degree of society's organization.

The PCF resolves all political questions by proceeding from specific problems existing in real life, G. Marchais stressed. This approach is the only way of struggling against the trend toward depoliticization. The degradation of political debate in the country is driving away millions of people. The PCF intends to act differently—to give priority not to the billing of ideas in the political marketplace but to actions locally, primarily at enterprises, with the people. We do not promise anyone miracles or the advent of some prophet who can resolve all problems. We call on the people to act together to take the resolution of their fate into their own hands. Since the 25th congress, the grassroots party organizations and the party leadership have made considerable efforts to ensure that the new political practice acquires life.

Under conditions of the acute political and ideological struggle, the success of our cause depends on how clearly and comprehensibly we bring our ideas to the broad people's masses, Georges Marchais pointed out. This is a priority task for all party organizations. The question of developing intraparty democracy is at the center of the present political struggle, he noted. In recent years, powerful pressure has been brought to bear on the PCF to force us to renounce the basic principle of the party's organization, that is democratic centralism, which would mean eliminating the revolutionary nature of our party. We have resisted these attacks and, I must say, we have resisted them quite well. The vitality of our principles is precisely what makes it possible to guarantee the unity and full independence of our party in all circumstances. Compared with existing democratic practice in the PCF, the organization of intraparty life in the country's other political parties is far-removed from democracy. The leaders of the right-wing parties appoint those parties' leading organs themselves. At the socialists' last congress, the previous leadership was in fact not reelected but appointed itself. A similar procedure exists in nominating candidates for the post of the country's president. What a contrast with the situation in the PCF, where the leaders from top to bottom are elected by secret ballot and each one can openly express himself on any document under discussion and even disagree with it.

Noting the growth in the numbers of the PCF recently, G. Marchais pointed to the need for more active and precise work by the primary party organizations in admitting new members and dwelled in detail on the demands made on present-day party leaders.

Debates began on G. Marchais' report at the congress.

Work of Congress Completed

PM071617 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 7 Dec 87 Second Edition p 6

[PRAVDA and TASS correspondents V. Bolshak and Yu. Lopatin dispatch: "Program of Struggle and Unity. The 26th French Communist Party Congress Concludes"]

[Text] Paris, 6 Dec—"The French Communist Party [PCF] is the party showing the way to the future." This slogan on the wall of the Palais des Sports in Saint-Ouen, where the 26th PCF Congress has been in progress since 2 December, now has new meaning. The new PCF program has been approved by an overwhelming majority: 1,692 votes, that is, 99.3% of the delegates in favor, with 12 abstentions. The political report presented at the congress by G. Marchais, general secretary of the PCF, was approved equally unanimously, with only 10 abstentions. Not a single vote was cast against these documents, which shows the full support enjoyed within the party by the political course adopted by its leadership.

Discussion of the comparatively small document entitled "Draft Resolution" continued within the PCF for almost 6 months, involving the lowest party organizations right up to the congress itself. Thousands of people helped to compile this document. Before it became the new "PCF Program" the drafting commission examined 1,638 proposals submitted during the discussion and made 285 amendments based on almost 900 proposals submitted by Communists. The commission only

rejected "cosmetic proposals" and, for reasons of principle, those "amendments" which emasculated the revolutionary essence of the party. Responding to the sources of these amendments, J.-C. Gayssot, chairman of the drafting commission and member of the Politburo and secretary of the PCF Central Committee, said that French Communists do not intend to deviate from their principles and reject the "social-democratization of the party." This seemingly casual phrase provides a clear evaluation of the activity of those factions on which enemies of the PCF have pinned so many hopes. They have failed in their attempt to divide the party. "Never since the evolution of its new strategy has our party been so strong and so united," J.-C. Gayssot said. "We are strong because of our revolutionary essence and our policy, which is fully consonant with the transforming movement characteristic of our time."

The party is also strong by virtue of its youth—the average age of the 26th PCF Congress delegates is 38—and its longstanding revolutionary traditions. Fernand Grenier is chairman of the PCF Veterans Society. His life is inseparably bound up with the history of the PCF. Addressing the congress, he said: "Our generation knew the crisis of the thirties which began in the United States and gripped the whole world. Capitalism found a way out of this crisis in World War II. In the years that have passed since then, we have seen how imperialism has gradually lost the ability to dictate to the world how it should be and whether there is going to be war or peace. It is now becoming increasingly clear that the solution to the present crisis can only be found in changing society itself. What is the main reason for imperialism's present weakness? The reason," the PCF veteran emphasized, pointing to the model of the cruiser "Avrora" presented to the congress by Comrade Ye.K. Ligachev on behalf of the CPSU Central Committee, "is the historic event of which the whole world was informed by the salvos fired from this very ship. A new world was born in Russia 70 years ago. The USSR, where 80% of the population was illiterate in 1917, has become one of the two most powerful states in the world, having played the decisive role in the defeat of fascism. Such is the strength of socialism, which is fully apparent in the USSR, where restructuring—this revolution within a revolution which will make it possible to advance the cause of socialism even further—is currently in progress."

Looking around the hall, Fernand Grenier added: "If I had to begin my life all over again, I would follow exactly the same path..." He has every reason to be proud of the younger generation: their inspired faces, lit as if from within, their worker character, and the firm handshake of people who know how to live in harmony and to fight when necessary. When the results of the vote on the "Draft Resolution" were announced, the entire hall rose to its feet in a single wave. The delegates were holding the text of the new program with which French Communists will enter the 21st century.

This major document defines the main tasks of the party and its strategy and tactics in the coming years. It will also serve as the basis of the campaign to support the Communist candidate, A. Lajoinie, in the presidential elections next spring.

The congress delegates elected a new PCF Central Committee and Central Commission for Financial Control. Today saw the first plenum of the newly elected PCF Central Committee, which elected members to the Central Committee Politburo, Central Committee Secretariat, and Central Commission for Political Control. Georges Marchais was reelected secretary general of the party.

G. Marchais delivered the closing speech at the final session.

Political & Social

Solomentsev Speaks to Chelyabinsk Voters

PM041625 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Discipline and Exactingness Are Conditions of Restructuring"]

[Text] Miass (Chelyabinsk Oblast), 2 Dec—To confidently follow the course of society's revolutionary renewal and be loyal to the banner of the Great October—these are the most important principles of the Communist Party's creative work. The restructuring it has launched throughout the country is built on a firm foundation—the 70 years of our history. It combines continuity with innovation, and the historical experience of Bolshevism with the present day of socialism.

There is no alternative to restructuring. A course of transforming all aspects of our life has been adopted. This was said today at the meeting between M.S. Solomentsev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee, and the voters of Miasskiy Electoral Okrug.

The meeting was opened by Miass Gorispolkom Chairman P.I. Kadochnikov.

The meeting was addressed by A.P. Borisov, first secretary of the Miass CPSU Gorkom; Yu.M. Novikov, manager of the "Uralavtostroy" trust; G.V. Kremleva, insulation worker at the "Miasselektroapparat" plant; turner Yu.F. Pashkov, member of the CPSU gorkom; and A.A. Romanchenko, chief designer at the Urals Motor Vehicles Plant, who emphasized that the oblast's working people unanimously approve the domestic and foreign policy of the Communist Party and the Soviet state. The course of restructuring resolutely implemented by the party is the only way to lead the country out of stagnation, to awaken every Soviet person's creative abilities, and to make Soviet people genuinely active and interested masters of their country. The representatives of labor collectives gave assurances that, through their selfless labor, people in Miass will make a fitting contribution to developing the economy of the oblast and the country.

Those assembled were addressed by M.S. Solomentsev.

Our meeting, he said, is taking place in a period abounding with major events. Soviet people and all progressive mankind only recently celebrated the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. The jubilee festivities vividly demonstrated the Soviet people's cohesion around the Communist Party and their active support for the course of acceleration and restructuring. They confirmed the strength of the international prestige of the CPSU and the Soviet state and our country's leading role in the struggle for peace and social progress. Revolutionary creation and October's living cause are continued in our deeds today. They are not only continued but also developed and deepened. Just like October, restructuring is the only correct answer to the challenge of the times. There is no other way for us.

The restructuring of society is a broad, large-scale concept. The process of restructuring embraces all spheres of social life—the economy, politics, the social and spiritual spheres, and every person. In implementing restructuring and improving and developing democratic institutions, glasnost, and control by the masses, we are not deviating from but moving toward socialism, deepening and enriching its potential. In the course of restructuring we will have to impart to socialism the most modern forms corresponding with the conditions of the scientific and technical revolution and fully implement Lenin's concept of socialism.

The CPSU Central Committee January and June (1987) Plenums created fundamental preconditions for deepening the process of the revolutionary transformations begun in April 1985 and consolidated by the strategic course of the 27th CPSU Congress. Nowadays restructuring is not just an idea, it is reality. Restructuring works to the benefit of socialism, to the benefit of society's renewal. Certain results have already been achieved along this path.

First of all, M.S. Solomentsev declared, a new political, moral, and psychological atmosphere has been created in the country. Its characteristic feature is people's enhanced interest in public affairs and in achieving significant labor results. People of all generations, and young people in particular, want to know as much as possible about the past, present, and future of the party and the country. There is greater interest in science, literature, art, and the problems of world outlook, morality, and ecology. The processes of glasnost, criticism and self-criticism, and democratization of all aspects of life are deepening. Public opinion has become weightier, and control by the masses has become more effective.

The general improvement in the tone of life has had an effect on practical affairs, and it is actually for this purpose that restructuring is being implemented. Qualitative changes have emerged in the economy. The national economy's development stems increasingly from intensive factors. Enterprises in the fuel and energy and metallurgy complexes are operating steadily this year. Certain positive results have been achieved in the agro-industrial complex. Changes for the better can also be noticed in the social sphere. Major measures are being implemented to improve education, medical and consumer services for the population, trade, and the production of goods for the people.

The party is objective and realistic in its assessment of what has been done. It emphasizes with the utmost clarity that the country is entering a new stage of restructuring involving the practical implementation of

what has been planned. Our entire policy and all our decisions must be translated into specific deeds and implemented. The fate of restructuring will be determined by two key problems: the further democratization of society and the radical reform of the economy. This is why the party's strategic line is being transformed in conformity with the realities of contemporary life and in the light of the new tasks that have to be solved.

Intense and purposeful work which produces tangible returns—this is the goal of the party, of every party organization, and of every Communist. This is also the main criterion for evaluating their activity and their participation in restructuring. It is necessary to act, to act, and to act yet again—energetically, boldly, creatively, and competently.

It is, however, no secret that by no means everyone in many party, soviet, and economic organs is marching in step with the times. Nor can we give in to pressure from those who express dissatisfaction with what they consider to be the slow pace of transformations, or with their supposed failure to produce immediate results. This is why the party emphasizes that, in the conditions of new and complex processes brought about by restructuring, it is extremely important to display revolutionary endurance, not to give up in the face of difficulties, and to find the best possible solutions to the tasks posed by life.

The next 2-3 years will be the most complex, decisive, and, to a certain extent, critical. This will be the period when we will have to solve simultaneously large-scale tasks in the economy, the social sphere, the restructuring of state and social management, and ideology and culture. Much of this will be done, so to speak, on the move, in the conditions of the old economic management mechanism. All this will demand colossal efforts by the party and the whole people. The importance of discipline, organization, and strict exactingness toward cadres and every Communist will be greater than ever before.

The struggle for restructuring has become an inalienable feature of labor life in the southern Urals. During this 5-year plan period Chelyabinsk Oblast's industry has been developing more dynamically than in the previous one. Positive changes are to be observed in the strengthening of the social sphere's material base and in housing construction. Working people in agriculture have worked intensively, although there are plenty of problems in the countryside.

There is a large accumulation of questions awaiting solution in the oblast. The most important of them is the economy's transfer to the tracks of intensive development. Primarily through a resolute improvement in the use of the achievements of science and technology.

But the state plan for the development of science and technology is not being fulfilled by the oblast's industrial enterprises and organizations. A lag has emerged in the solution of the most important scientific and technical problems and the fulfillment of targeted programs. Yet people in the southern Urals have considerable potential. The forces of inertia and complacency are evidently still powerful. Not all labor collectives have restructured themselves or become aware of the extent of the responsibility they have to bear. This reproach also applies to Miass. Technical thinking here can also be much more fruitful.

The level of return on capital in the oblast's industry shows no growth of production efficiency, either. In 1985 it amounted to only 92% of the 1980 level, and the level in Miass was even lower. One of the reasons is the slow replacement of obsolete equipment, and chronic ailments are still making themselves felt today.

Take for example the machine shift index. The party has now taken measures to provide incentives labor in two- and three-shift working. Yet the machine shift index in the city's main shops stands at only 1.5. This is clearly insufficient. The shift index of machine tools with digital program control and those of the "processing center" type is improving only slowly. Even though it is well-known that the Leningraders' initiative, which has been approved by the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, consists of concentrating two- and three-shift working primarily on advanced and progressive equipment. The maximum return is to be obtained from it, and old equipment is to be removed, thus opening the path for modernization. It is obviously necessary to give thorough attention to the Leningraders' experience and adopt it more swiftly.

To work in the new fashion today means to fulfill the plan, especially in terms of contractual deliveries. But many of the oblast's collectives are hardly making any efforts to fulfill consumers' orders. For example, 41% of associations and enterprises failed to fulfill their contractual commitments in the 1st 10 months of this year. This situation must be rectified and the year must be ended in a fitting manner.

M.S. Solomentsev went on to dwell on the problem of output quality and emphasized that the powerful stimulus of pride in the reputation of one's trade mark, of one's collective, must be mobilized in restructuring. This is especially important in the conditions of state acceptance, whose operations will be substantially expanded in the new year.

The speaker noted that the expansion of housing construction, the strengthening of the social and cultural sphere, and the manufacture of consumer goods—all this demands constant attention and concern, primarily on the part of labor collectives themselves.

Take the food problem, for example. Of course, the main workload in this is borne by rural working people. But urban residents must not remain indifferent observers. It is, for example, impossible to tolerate the fact that the number of subsidiary farms under oblast enterprises is declining.

The CPSU Central Committee especially drew the oblast party organization's attention to shortcomings in the development of stockraising in the oblast. It is a matter of honor for Communists and all working people in the agro-industrial complex to implement all measures to ensure the swiftest possible improvement of food supplies to the population.

In general, the social justice of our social system must be reflected in all matters, both great and small. What is needed now is more purposefulness and persistence in satisfying the working people's material and cultural demands and in implementing the principle "From each according to his ability, to each according to his labor."

Strict exactingness must be shown toward absentees and negligent and slipshod workers. This is genuine social justice.

Economic mismanagement is the worst enemy of restructuring. It inflicts enormous material, political, and moral damage on the country, it not only deprives us of additional wealth but also undermines society's moral foundations. Its eradication is a direct obligation of party organizations and every labor collective.

Dwelling on questions concerning the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism, which is an important avenue of restructuring, M.S. Solomentsev noted that not all party and public organizations are yet persistently solving these problems. The educational role and influence of labor collectives are inadequate, and a skillful combination of economic, administrative, and legal measures has not been ensured everywhere.

The problem of drunkenness is also acute in Chelyabinsk Oblast. Evidence of this can be seen in the recent meeting of the oblast party organization's aktiv especially devoted to stepping up the struggle against drunkenness and alcoholism. Without public support, it is difficult to expect success in a matter like the eradication of drunkenness and drug addiction and the affirmation of a sober way of life.

No matter which problem we tackle, its solution ultimately depends on the working people themselves. Particular importance attaches to the development of democracy in production. Working people's initiative and creativity can be boosted only if our democratic institutions exert an active, real influence on the state of affairs in every labor collective and in literally all matters of planning, labor organization, and distribution of material and other benefits. Especially the selection of the most authoritative and competent workers for leadership positions.

The main point in the party leadership of the economy now is to do everything for the implementation by labor collectives of their new rights and potential. Enterprises and production associations constitute the central link of restructuring, of radical economic reform. Broad opportunities are offered here by the Law on the State Enterprise (Association), which will come into force next year.

The enhancement of the effectiveness of control "from below," of control by the masses, is of fundamental importance. Systematic accountability by leaders to labor collectives is certainly one of the levers which make control by working people a reality. If we achieve this everywhere, then many questions which working people refer to central party and soviet organs will be solved at the local level, in other words where they ought to be solved.

By no means everything is ideal in your oblast in this regard. Over a 22-month period, the CPSU Central Committee Party Control Committee received from Chelyabinsk Oblast over 1,000 letters containing various critical alerts. However, the solution of the overwhelming majority of questions raised by these letters lies within the competence of local party, soviet, and economic organs. The writers had applied to them, but either received formal replies or their applications were turned down.

The further development of glasnost is a powerful means of enhancing the efficiency of control by the masses. This is a question of paramount importance, it affects everyone. Without glasnost there cannot be any genuine democratism, creative attitude on the part of working people toward work, or participation by them in management. It is necessary to turn it into a flawlessly operating system. The party emphasizes that the expansion of glasnost is neither a campaign nor an "event." It is a norm of our daily life. Only the maximum openness in the activity of state and public organizations will give the working people a real opportunity to participate actively in the affairs of their team, shop, plant, and city.

While on the subject of democracy and control by the masses, we cannot overlook questions of criticism and self-criticism. I must say that this tested instrument of socialist democratism is still insufficiently used. Some officials perceive criticisms of them as an attempt to destroy their authority. There are still disgraceful instances of suppression of criticism or persecution over criticism. The facts prove that people who criticize economic mismanagement, window dressing, bureaucratism, or incorrect behavior by some leaders are not always supported by local authorities.

The expansion of democracy, M.S. Solomentsev went on, poses new tasks for party control organs. Today it is becoming increasingly evident that unless the monitoring and verification of execution are stepped up, the tasks facing society cannot be solved. The party control organs now keep an eye on the problems of widely using the achievements of scientific and technical progress and on questions of social development. Exactingness toward cadres and all Communists has been decisively stepped

up as regards the fulfillment of Central Committee and government resolutions, the observance of party and state discipline, and the pure and honest image of party members.

We all know what responsible tasks face cadres at rayon and city level in solving the problems of restructuring. Particular emphasis is placed on boosting the militancy of primary party organizations. The party believes that it is necessary to actively involve every Communist in the process of restructuring and to mobilize all labor collectives for restructuring.

The oblast will soon hold meetings of Communists and party committee plenums to hear reports by elected organs on their work to lead restructuring. It is important to ensure that a businesslike and keen discussion takes place everywhere about the vital affairs of primary party organizations and labor collectives. This will be all the more valuable in view of the fact that the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference, which will discuss the tasks of party organizations in deepen the process of restructuring, is not very far off. I would like to hope that the Communists of the Chelyabinsk Oblast party organization will bring to it valuable and interesting experience of party leadership of restructuring.

The speaker went on to dwell on topical questions of the foreign policy of the CPSU and the Soviet state. Soviet people, he said, are well aware of the tremendous international importance of our restructuring. Its success will represent socialism's decisive contribution to the cause of peace and progress at the present stage.

The Land of the Soviets, M.S. Solomentsev said in conclusion, has entered its 8th decade. Major and important work lies ahead on restructuring and the renewal of all aspects of our society's life. Now it is important to consolidate and boost the upsurge of political and labor activeness generated by the preparation for and celebration of Great October's 70th anniversary. To work with total dedication for the sake of the triumph of socialism—this is a matter of honor for every Soviet person!

Medvedev Dnepropetrovsk Activities Noted

PM041546 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Visit to Dnepropetrovskaya Oblast"]

[Text] V.A. Medvedev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was in Dnepropetrovsk Oblast 30 November through 2 December. He visited a number of industrial and agricultural enterprises and associations, scientific institutions, and sociocultural projects.

In the course of the meetings and talks with the oblast's working people and party and economic leaders, there was a detailed discussion of the fulfillment of the 27th CPSU Congress decisions and the implementation of the restructuring. Special attention was devoted to the preparation of enterprises and associations for work in the new economic management conditions, their transfer to full economic accountability, self-financing, and self-capitalization, and the development of democratic forms of management.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee inquired about the widening of direct production and scientific and technical ties between the oblast's enterprises and partners in socialist countries.

In Krivoy Rog, V.A. Medvedev met with the collective of scientists and specialists at the Mekhanobrchermet Institute, which is the sector's biggest research and design center. At the experimental production unit he studied new technology and equipment for ore mining enterprises, including equipment for the enrichment of oxidized ores. V.A. Medvedev visited the Novokrivorozhskiy and Yuzhnyy mining enrichment combines and trade, consumer services, and transport facilities. He inquired about the development of the social sphere, the resolution of the housing question, the provision of food products to the citizens, and the use of the forms of cooperative and individual labor activity.

At the Michurin Sovkhoz in Krivorozhskiy Rayon and the Ulyanov Kolkhoz in Sofiyevskiy Rayon, questions included the fuller use of reserves and potential to significantly increase production in order to improve supplies of milk, meat, potatoes, and vegetables in the Krivoy Rog field. The need was stressed for more persistent introduction of the team and family contract and for heightened attention to be paid to keeping livestock, including cows, on personal plots.

In Dnepropetrovsk, V.A. Medvedev visited the experimental sections of the All-Union Scientific Research, Design, and Technological Insittute of the Pipe Industry and the shops of the Nizhnedneprovskiy K. Liebknecht pipe rolling plant. He stressed the particular importance of widening the range and improving the quality of metallurgical output and going over to resource-saving technology, which makes it possible considerably to reduce the national economy's metal requirements. The need was noted to use experience and improve cooperation with labor collectives in the socialist countries on this question.

V.A. Medvedev met with members of the party obkom bureau. An exchange of opinions took place on topical questions of the work of the oblast party organization and the deepening of cooperation with the socialist countries in all spheres of activity. The importance was stressed of stepping up the work of the oblast's party organizations at the new stage of the restructuring and increasing their role in the practical implementation of radical economic reform. In this connection, it is important to conduct in a businesslike and highly active

manner the party meetings that have begun in the oblast, with reports by elected party organs and communist leaders on the progress of the restructuring.

Vorotnikov Inspects Tambov Facilities

LD041029 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 3 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; video report by correspondent A. Parfenenkov]

[Text] Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov is in Tambov Oblast.How is the social sphere developing in ancient Tambov? What must be done to improve supplies of foodstuffs and goods to the townspeople? Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov dealt with these and many other vital questions for the people of Tambov in conversation with inhabitants of the oblast center. He visited the Tambov specialized shop and supermarket, where he took an interest in the quality and range of consumer goods. Their production per inhabitant of Tambov Oblast is 40% of the average for the Russian Federation.

The housing problem is also acute in the Tambov region. More than 70,000 families in Tambov Oblast are in need of it. Great hopes are vested in the fully prefabricated house-building combine. [video shows exterior and interior scenes of prefabricated houses] Here is some of its production. Such comfortable houses with outbuildings have already adorned many Tambov villages. Demand for them is high, in spite of the rather high price, but the house-builders are not yet able to satisfy it: They have not yet met the combine's rated capacity.

In conversation with managers, specialists, and workers from the enterprise, Vitaliy Ivanovich Vorotnikov asked them about the problems that are putting the brakes on production, and about reserves—they do exist, and there are quite a few of them. By putting them into operation, it would be possible to turn out over 1,200 houses annually. It is also important to think about reducing the prime costs of this production, which is so necessary in the countryside.

Demichev, Others Mark Law Courts Anniversary

LD050112 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Text] a solemn meeting devoted to the 70th anniversary of the soviet courts of law took place in Moscow today. In the Presidium there were Comrades Demichev, Lukyanov, and Razumovskiy, as well as representatives of the capital's public. Comrade Kravtsov, USSR minister of justice, delivered a report.

On the same day a meeting of veterans of judicial bodies and institutions and courts of law took place at the USSR Justice Ministry. Its participants were warmly greeted on the significant date by Comrade Lukyanov.

Dolgikh Speaks at Shipping Conference

LD052344 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 5 Dec 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A conference of leaders and secretaries of party shipping line committees and heads of the higher education institutions connected with the shipping ministry was held at the USSR Ministry of the Maritime Fleet. Participants reviewed tasks to improve work with cadres and to enhance the role of party committees in securing restructuring in the maritime fleet.

Comrade Dolgikh spoke at the conference.

Razumovskiy Activities in Lithuania Noted

PM041548 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Visit to Lithuania"]

[Text] Vilnius, 2 Dec—G.P. Razumovskiy, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, was in Lithuania 30 November through 2 December.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee studied the way in which the republic's party, soviet, and economic organs ensure the resolution of large-scale tasks in accelerating socioeconomic development.

In Vilnius and Kaunas he inspected residential districts, inquired about the volume and pace of housing construction, the quality of the construction workers' work, and the resolution of social questions, studied the work of trading enterprises, and talked with residents.

G.P. Razumovskiy familiarized himself with the work of the collective and party organization of the Vilnius V.I. Lenin Calculator Plant and visited the shops, consumer facilities, cafeteria, and sports facilities. In conversations with workers, engineers, and technicians, he inquired about how the collective is working under the conditions of economic accountability, self-financing, and self-capitalization, how the activity of economic accountability subunits and teams is organized, and how the new forms of economic management influence the growth of the working people's labor activeness, the acceleration of scientific and technical progress, and the improvement of product quality. Great attention was devoted to what is being done to create good conditions for the labor and leisure of workers at the plant.

At the Rokay Kolkhoz in Kaunasskiy Rayon, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee studied the work of the highly productive farm under economic accountability and inquired about the working and living conditions of the rural inhabitants. In conversations with kolkhoz members and a group of farm leaders and secretaries of primary party organizations from the rayon, the discussion centered on increasing the interest of rural workers

in the end results of their labor, on the further intensification of production, and on the need for consistent provision of social facilities in the countryside.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee visited the Kaunas 50th Anniversary of October Artificial Fibers Plant. Talking with the workers and foremen, he asked about the training of young recruits from the working class and moral and material incentives for labor.

G.P. Razumovskiy spoke at a meeting with the republic's party and economic aktiv. Discussion centered on the vanguard role of communists at the new stage of the restructuring. The special significance of the reports of elected party organs, now taking place, was stressed. They should take place at a high level of party exactingness and self-criticism and give an effective boost to all future work.

The secretary of the CPSU Central Committee laid flowers at the V.I. Lenin monument in Vilnius. He visited the Exhibition of National Economic Achievements, the Lithuanian SSR Museum of Revolution, and the M.-K. Chyurlenis Museum.

G.P. Razumovskiy was accompanied on his trip by R.-B.I. Songayla, first secretary of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee, and V.V. Sakalauskas, chairman of the republic Council of Ministers.

Astrauskas Elected Lithuanian Supsov President

LD071544 Moscow TASS in English 1533 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] Vilnius December 7 TASS—Vitautas Astrauskas, 57, was elected today president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of Lithuania at a session of parliament of that Soviet Baltic republic. He replaced on this post Ringaudas-Bronislovas Songaila who was elected first secretary of the Communist Party of Lithuania.

Vitautas Astrauskas worked in the central apparatus of the Communist Party of Lithuania and was in charge of trade and communal services. Since 1981 Astrauskas has been secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Lithuania.

Komsomol CC Begins Meeting in Moscow

LD071804 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 7 Dec 87

[Text] The Central Committee of the Young Communist League [Komsomol] the largest public organization of the Soviet young people, with a membership of 40 million, has opened a full-scale meeting here in Moscow. The league will focus on young people's role in solving the Soviet Union's economic and social problems by joining the ongoing restructuring in the country.

'Underground Trade Unionist' Released

LD081141 Hamburg DPA in German 1111 GMT 8 Sep 87

[Text] Bonn (DPA)—The Russian underground trade unionist Vladimir Lyubovich was released from enforced psychiatric treatment near Moscow on 3 December, it was learned in Bonn today. The chairman of the Subcommittee for Human Rights of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Friedrich Vogel (CDU), who had campaigned for Lyubovich's release, welcomed this step as an expression of goodwill by the Soviet authorities.

Historians To Write Study on World War II

LD061629 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] Soviet military history experts and scientists from the biggest historical institutes belonging to the Soviet Academy of Sciences have begun to work on a 10-volume study into the role of the Soviet people in the Second World War.

They plan to give an impartial picture of the key war events, to define more precisely the losses in manpower and materiel and to estimate the activity of the headquarters and the supreme commander.

Importance of People's Historical Memory

PM041414 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1

[Aleksandr Ilin article: "A Moment of Remembrance"]

[Text] Let us stand for a while by the Eternal Flame.

On the Field of Mars in Leningrad—cradle of Great October.

Before the ancient walls of the Kremlin, at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

In the squares of other cities and villages in our country where the flame of memory is kindled—to the glory of the knights of our revolution and the heroes of the Great Patriotic War, to the glory of all who devoted their lives, to their very last breath, to the struggle for our present, for our future.

The living, flickering flame flutters in the wind. The sacred fire burns, kindling in people's hearts a sense of sincere filial gratitude. Kindling thoughts of the unbreakable continuity of the generations, of the heroic traditions of the Leninist party and the people, without which we cannot imagine our life today. Of the magnitude of our predecessors' achievements and of the responsibility of those who live today for the continuation of the great cause of October, for the development of the glorious traditions, for the fate of the restructuring that has begun

in the country, the revolutionary renewal of society. For the proud right and hard duty to be the pioneers along the path of communist creation, peace, and social progress.

The Eternal Flame burns.... How many people touched it in their hearts and memories, during the days of the 70th anniversary of Great October. During those days, special days in our life, of the jubilee of the Land of the Soviets, of which the report at the ceremonial session in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses said figuratively: This is a moment of pride, a moment of remembrance, a moment for reflection, and also a look into the future.

Remembering the past and looking into the future—although they appear to be at opposite poles, these concepts are in fact indissolubly interconnected. One is measured against the other, the living current of time passes through the present, through our minds and hearts, through our deeds and plans. And when we turn to history we are turning to our own origins, to the experience of the revolutionary reorganization [pereustroystvo] of society, learning lessons from victories and defeats in order to find the right paths for forward movement, in order to tackle in the best possible way the pressing questions of democratization, the strengthening of the rule of law, glasnost, and the eradication of bureaucracy, questions facing the party and country today, in the course of the restructuring.

Doubtless this is the main explanation for the fact that in jubilee year, in the seething whirlpool of major, urgent tasks and pressing concerns, people thought and argued probably more keenly and agitatedly than ever before about past experience. In the pages of the newspapers and journals, in television and radio programs, among comrades at work and at home in the family. And PRAVDA's editorial mail, in recent weeks, has contained large numbers of letters of testimony, letters of reflection on the time, the motherland, ourselves. The authors' views on particular problems and events are different and sometimes diametrically opposed, the evaluations of historical figures, the conclusions, the proposals are various. Some readers saw a danger in any attempt to tell the truth, however bitter, about negative phenomena, mistakes, and the losses that are inevitable along a difficult path. Sometimes they even saw a danger in acknowledging that there were in our history both joys and disasters, exploits and defeats, heroism and tragedy. The other extreme is also encountered in the pre-October letters: Too much has already been said, they say, about achievements and successes, and too little about difficulties, contradictions, errors, let us at last focus the main attention on them....

It is well-known that extremes converge; for us, both extremes are equally unacceptable—and the majority of letter writers agree on this—both the desire to avoid encountering "inconvenient" facts, and destructive nihilism and the inability to see beyond the pitfalls along the road to the movement—difficult movement, sometimes with interruptions, but continuing movement onward and upward. Life is not a flowing river, it is made up of contradictions, the poet said. The people's memory, unlike the memory of an individual, preserves everything, without the slightest omission, and in interpreting history we must not forget anything, we must not pretend that something that happened does not exist for us. Anything else would be a deviation from the scientific approach to historical experience and would mean built-in subjectivity.

Is it worth referring yet again to the disputes and doubts—after all, the answer to the pressing questions has been given, a convincing, exhaustive answer, Leninist in its directness and truthfulness? Yes, I think it is worth it. First and foremost, in order to sense and grasp more clearly and distinctly the realism of the party approach to evaluating the past. An approach based on a sense of historical responsibility and founded on historical truth. This approach permeates—from the first line to the last—M.S. Gorbachev's report "October and Restructuring: The Revolution Continues." It reveals profoundly, comprehensively, without silences or embellishment, the significance of the most important periods in our history for the fate of the Soviet state and the fate of socialism and gives a well-argued rebuff to attempts abroad to discredit socialism as a new social system, a real alternative to capitalism. There is a worthy place both for the undisputed achievements which mark the 70-year path of the Land of the Soviets, and for those phenomena which bear the stamp of tragedy. It is truthful analysis of the past and honest understanding both of the tremendous gains and of the errors and miscalculations and their origins, causes, and consequences that give us a true guide in resolving the urgent tasks of the restructuring, a real moral compass pointing to the future.

It has rightly been observed that we do not judge the past—recent or remote; we do not seek with hindsight to highlight some things and draw a veil over others: everything that happened, happened, and happened to us, to our people, to our country—joys and griefs, gains and losses. The truth and only the truth elevates both history and man. We need the truth because we love our country, we want to make it better and prevent a repetition of whatever led to tragedies.

"The motherland's history," Leningrader S. Tikhomirov writes to the editorial office, "is not a Christmas tree, you do not have to decorate it and turn the bare branches to the corner so that they cannot be seen. And it is not a family album from which you can remove the photograph of some rogue who has wormed his way in by chance." The essence of the restructuring, in the author's opinion, lies in learning to safeguard the motherland and develop social guarantees of the victory of good over evil, and that, he notes, is only possible given full, constant glasnost that is energetic against evil. N. Kondratyuk from the Moscow region is worried about the

same thing: "True, you cannot remake history that has already taken place. But how to make history from now on, how it is to be, what should be written on its next, as yet blank pages—that is our task, and it is in our hands to resolve it one way or another."

Yes, it is only fully armed with the truth that we can find our way around the labyrinths of the past, find and take away from it not the ashes, but the fire—the purifying fire that generates not despondency and skepticism, but confidence and optimism, and gives us spiritual energy for new achievements.

This fire is in the labor and heroism of millions of people, each of whom made his contribution to our common socialist gains. It is handed down to us by the Leninist Bolsheviks, the warriors of the party which, under V.I. Lenin's leadership, raised the people of Russia, their best, most honest forces, to storm the old world. By those who laid the foundations of the new society, those who smelted the steel, sowed the grain, taught the children, carried science and technology forward, scaled the heights in art. Those who built Magnitka and Dneproges, Uralmash, Komsomolsk-na-Amure, the Turkestan-Siberia Railroad and the Great Fergana Canal, and the other projects in our 5-year plans which became symbols of the achievements of the Land of the Soviets and testimonies to the great energy of emancipated labor. Those who, defending the motherland, fell in battle and gave society the opportunity to go forward at the cost of their own lives.

It is the people who make history, and it is impossible to name all the names worthy of going down in the book of the generations' memory. All the same, I would like to name at least a few of them. The careers and destinies of many of them were complex and sometimes tragic, but they all remain, for us, living examples of staunchness, courage, Soviet patriotism, and selfless service to the cause of October.

Sergey Mironovich Kirov and Sergo Ordzhonikidze are two of the glorious cohorts of the revolutionary guard. They were friends in life, comrades in work, and true warriers of the Leninist party. Many years have passed, but to this day in Leningrad, Baku, Astrakhan, wherever Kirov worked, people remember with love "our Mironych" and his attentiveness and concern for people, his sensitivity to the new, his ability to support initiative and boldness. Anyone who has been to our heavy industrial plants knows how people there cherish the memory of People's Commissar Sergo, who was present at the origins of the formation of the socialist state's industrial might, generously devoted his energy and spiritual forces to the education of workers and specialists, and gave many of them a passport to life.

Miner Aleksey Stakhanov and the major organizer of industry Avraamiy Zavenyagin... These people had different lives, but they have something fundamental in common. Both—each in his own field, in his own way—were pioneers and knew how to make breakthroughs into the unknown. Stakhanov's name is perpetuated in the movement he started, a movement of worker-innovators toward unheard-of heights of labor productivity on the basis of the skillful use of machinery. Zavenyagin's name is borne by the Norilsk mining and metallurgical combine which he built, where, despite all the difficulties and tragic circumstances, he encouraged and defended bold design solutions which were ahead of their time. Just as he did during the years when he worked together with Kurchatov on creating the motherland's nuclear shield.

There is an old, "high-style" word—"feat" [deyaniye]. We quite rightly rarely use it, and all the same, I think it is quite apposite when you are talking about what was done for our science, for our country, by the great geneticist Nikolay Vavilov and by Chief Designer Sergey Korolev, who paved the way into space. Time left its tragic marks on their lives, but nothing will ever extinguish the Promethean fire kindled by these heroes.

And how many names are preserved by the memory of the terrible years of the Great Patriotic War. Marshal Georgiy Zhukov and political instructor Vasiliy Klochkov-Diyev, Private Aleksandr Matrosov and partisan and Komsomol member Zoya Kosmodemyanskaya... There is scarcely a family on which the war did not leave its bitter mark, and the roll of honor of the heroes could go on and on; let everyone add a name that is particularly dear to him... The war was, for us, the whole people's war, a sacred war, and the main burden was borne by the ordinary Soviet soldier—that great worker and patriot. Our gratitude also to those who forged the weapons of Victory, who worked heroically in the rear and shared the lives of the fighters in the front line.

We often repeat the words "Nobody is forgotten, nothing is forgotten," but it cannot be denied that we do not always think about them, we do not always recognize that this is not the finished result, but a slogan calling for action. Our memory cannot, should not be contemplative, it starves without activeness, without living, concrete actions. There is the quest, the restoration of the still unknown names of fallen heroes, there is assistance to war and labor veterans and to soldiers' widows, there is concern for the education of the young generations on the basis of patriotic traditions and in the spirit of devotion to October's ideals.

Can we say that historical education is organized in our country in the way the times dictate? Unfortunately, there is still a good deal of dogmatism and tedium in the teaching of history in school and in higher education, and not infrequently meetings with veterans and similar events take place purely formally and soullessly, to score points. In some places, because of indifference and the reluctance to take on an extra burden, museums of combat glory created by enthusiasts are closing and documents that are very precious to the veterans and their families are being lost without trace, as if they had

no special value. The failure to remember, like the thoughtless manipulation of historical facts for the sake of sensation or idle curiosity, cruelly cripples the soul, especially in young people.

Historical truth demands respect and a solicitous attitude from each of us. Let us be up to these demands. Let us preserve its sacred, purifying flame.

Today we are the guardians of the Eternal Flame.

Work of Visa Office, Refusal Reasons Viewed
PM071710 Moscow TRUD in Russian 6 Dec 87 p 3

[TASS correspondent Vladimir Itkin reportage for TRUD from the Visas and Registration Administration: "And If We Are Frank?"]

[Text] As soon as it is a question of the problem of human rights, the broadcasters on the Voice of America and Radio Liberty and the authors of writings in POSEV and other anti-Soviet publications invariably reduce the whole affair to speculations over entry to and exit from the USSR, the reuniting of "divided families," and so forth.

Precise and clear explanations have been provided on this subject, repeatedly and at every level. But who are the foreign "zealots" of various ranks and callings still making a fuss about?

I would like to describe what I saw and heard at the Visas and Registration Administration of the Moscow Gorispolkom Main Administration of Internal Affairs, where I spent several days. Doubtless the archives of the editorial offices of many Western radio stations, newspapers, and magazines have files marked on their title pages "10 Kolpachnyy Lane, Moscow, USSR." Just as they have files marked "Petrovka," "Ogareva," "Zhitnaya," and "Dzerzhinka." These Moscow streets and alleys, where the competent Soviet organizations are located, are always under the keen eye of Western journalists with time on their hands and all kinds of Sovietologists. But particular attention is, for some reason, paid to these addresses on the eve of very important political events.

...I had difficulty parking my car in the narrow Kolpachnyy Lane. It was reception day at the Visas Administration, and cars with Soviet, foreign, and diplomatic number plates stood literally "bumper to bumper." Administration chief Sergey Ivanovich Alpatov, a man of few words, said merely: "Well, sit down and listen. Today the reception is conducted by Lieutenant Colonel of Militia Ilya Aleksandrovich Karakulko, deputy chief of the Visas Administration, and Captain of Militia Viktor Vasilyevich Marachev, senior inspector."

I discovered that cases not requiring additional explanations or documents are resolved promptly, "on the spot," as they say.

Two young people come into the room. They are holding hands. The guy introduces himself: Andrey Urepin. "Marian is my wife. We have registered our marriage. She is American and her visa to stay in the USSR runs out today. Please extend it for 3 months."

I.A. Karakulko sees no reason to refuse the U.S. citizen an extension of her visa. Marian received it before my very eyes, a few hours later.

Another visitor stuck in my mind—Professor Yakov Lvovich Alpert, gray, agile, born in 1911. He is on a pension and has been away for a long time from the work he was engaged in at the scientific research institute. Now, together with his wife Svetlana Nikolayevna Pivkova, born in 1941, he is leaving for abroad, on an Israeli visa. All the formalities have been settled. Yakov Lvovich had come to the Visas Administration to ask advice about registering his baggage at Sheremetyevo airport customs.

Basya Iosifovna Shvarts is planning to go and stay in the United States at her sister's invitation. She is in a hurry—her sister is not well—and asks the Visas Administration to speed up her departure. The delay with her exit visa is because of an unclear point in the documents: whether Basya Iosifovna's sister is at present a U.S. citizen. I.A. Karakulko assures the visitor that this question will be resolved in the next few days. Immediately after Shvarts has left he lifts the telephone and tells his staffers to make inquiries into the case without delay, this very day.

But now the door opens and a man comes in who is evidently well-known to everyone here. And as he greets them he addresses those who are conducting the reception today by their names. This man's name is well-known in the West. He is a "poor relation," a "refusenik," a "champion of human rights in the USSR," and so forth. He also figures on the typed list that was handed literally a few days ago to the chief of the Moscow Visas Administration by two respectable U.S. citizens who came to the Soviet capital as tourists.

Almost simultaneously with their appearance at No 10 Kolpachnyy Lane, a demonstration of "refuseniks" took place. Some 10 or 12 people took crumpled posters from their pockets and pinned them on over their clothes. Incidentally, there were twice as many foreign correspondents photographing and filming this ballyhoo than there were demonstrators.

And at that very moment S.I. Alpatov, with his characteristic restraint and self-possession, was receiving the American tourists at their request. Stanley Y. Michaels, a member of the Manhattan municipality, and Noah Dyer, a member of the New York municipality, left a petition giving names well-known to the administration staffers: Vladimir Dashevskiy, Roman Pyatigorskiy, Grigoriy Rozenshteyn, Yuriy Kosherovskiy, Aleksandr Kholmyanskiy...

When Alpatov tried to find out from the members of the municipalities whether they know the people they are petitioning for, the surprising answer was: "Our newspapers write about them." Stanley Y. Michaels and Noah Dyer were unable to say anything more....

So we will have to fill them in. Aleksandr Kholmyanskiy planned to go to his aunt in Israel, to live there permanently. His brother Mikhail, who left earlier to join the same aunt, went to the Voice of America for help and asked for his "poor relation" Aleksandr to join him, attacking the "Soviet authorities' tyranny." In fact, nobody was stopping Aleksandr. The only trouble is, the father of his wife Anna, Yakov Bentsionovich Yerukhimovich, objects categorically to the departure for Isarel. This man has 38 years of honest, irreproachable work behind him. Together with his wife, he raised their only daughter, and they dreamed of raising their grandchildren—here at home, in Russia, in their own motherland. Here is a recent letter from him to the Visas Administration: "In my letters I asked for my daughter Anna Yakovlevna Kholmyanskaya to be refused permission to emigrate to Israel, giving my reasons. My request was granted. But recently the situation has been complicated by the fact that under pressure from her husband and his relatives, my daughter went on a hunger strike. The fact that Kholmyanskiy demanded and allowed a prolonged hunger strike by a wife who has a 6-month-old baby is an indication that he is a cruel fanatic, and my wife and I very much fear for our daughter's well-being in the event of her departure. But now, because of a severe deterioration in my daughter's health and fearing for her life, on 10 November 1987 I was forced to give her a document in the form laid down...."

I.A. Karakulko takes from the shelves one "file" after another. There are letters, statements, notarial certificates, petitions bearing the stamps of foreign states' departments, correspondence with the USSR Foreign Ministry and the USSR MVD. Requests, responses. In a number of the documents from people wishing to leave the Soviet Union, even I, a nonspecialist, can see the fabrications, inventions, or, more simply, "fakes."

Take the case of Mark Davidovich Shifrin and Slava Moiseyevna Zatulovskaya. Since 1980 this married couple, the father and mother of two children, have been petitioning to leave to join their brother in Israel. The questionnaire filled in by Slava Moiseyevna says: Father—Moisey Zakharovich Zatulovskiy, died 1957. Mother—Etya-Khaya Shayevna Belenkaya, died 1971.

Then, all at once, a statement entered the case which cast light not only on the authenticity of the documents, but also on the moral nature of the applicants. The "disturbers of the peace" were Liya Moiseyevna Zatulovskaya and Moisey Solomonovich Gluzberg, who wrote to say that they are Slava's mother and father. It turned out that fictitious parents were named on the questionnaire. After this whole unseemly story, Moisey Solomonovich Gluzberg, a fine man, a scientist, doctor of philosophical sciences and professor of the philosophy faculty at Moscow State Pedagogical Institute, died, being unable to stand the shock.

No, I cannot understand that, I, who lost my parents long ago—my mom Raisa Zakharovna raised us without our father Ilya Abramovich (who fought on the fronts of the Great Patriotic War from the first day of the war until the last); apart from my sister and me, she raised two more children. I cannot understand Slava Moiseyevna's "philosophy." Even after her father's death, clearly aware that she herself had accelerated it, she continued to blackmail her mother by telephone: "If you don't give permission, my husband and I will split up. My husband and daughter will leave, so you will never see your grandchildren."

And Liya Moiseyevna never did see her grandchildren. She gave way and signed a paper. On 30 November her only daughter and grandchildren crossed the USSR state border. The old woman was left alone in Moscow.

Some would-be emigres engage in all kinds of trickery. Those who are refused visas for one of two reasons: when, instead of reuniting a family, the family is in effect being broken up, or because they have knowledge of state or military secrets, which affects the country's security interests.

Here is the questionnaire filled in by Yuliya Lvovna Shurukht, who wants to leave for Israel:

"Have you changed your surname, forename, or patronymic?" "I have not changed my forename and patronymic. In 1974 I changed my surname from my father's name, Shurukht, to my mother's name, Tryasunova, on my mother's insistence. In 1981 I changed my name to Yakovenko when I married. In 1982 I changed to Tryasunova when I was divorced, and in 1986 I changed to Shurukht, according to my birth certificate, at my own wish." "Are you married?" "Yes, I am married to Mikhail Abovich Stolyar (a religious marriage)."

And here is another story. One of my journalist colleagues, talking about the young swimmer Vassa Gerasimova, who left her motherland, put it like this: "She dived in Madrid and surfaced in San Francisco." At that time, in 1982, we were at a loss to understand how this young girl, a member of the national team, could betray her fatherland and her comrades. Today it has all become clear: Her parents set her on to it, her father, artist A.P. Zhdanov, and mother, Candidate of Technical Sciences G.M. Gerasimova. This was the plan: Throw out the daughter abroad, and then demand reunification with the "family"—but not in your own homeland. Where have Zhdanov and Gerasimova not poured out their wrath, which radio voices have not broadcast their "appeal for justice," which base anti-Soviet foreign pamphlets have not printed angry articles by them! Well, they got their visas. Perhaps they've already left.

There is also another category of people who proudly call themselves "refuseniks." Take Emmanuil Abramovich Smelyanskiy: The law on maintaining secrecy barred his exit. The man writes to all the ends of the earth: "My wife is so ill that it can only end one way. She could only be cured over there...." Smelyanskiy figures on many lists brought to our country by respectable people from abroad. Smelyanskiy's file contains petitions from Israel, Britain, France, the United States, Switzerland.... And everywhere—"Let Smelyanskiy go." Robert Dreyfus even sends a telegram from France: "Smelyanskiy is going to kill himself."

It was a false alarm. "Refusenik" Smelyanskiy is alive and well. He has long since been given permission to leave, as have his wife and son. The permission was given in April. But what has happened? Emmanuil Abramovich is not going anywhere yet. That sometimes happens: The "case" itself is what is important to people.

...I remember a question put by the NBC correspondent in the interview with the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee: "...4,000 Soviet Jews, who have been waiting for visas for a long time? Some of them are cancer victims who want to join their relatives. What do you think about them, in human terms?" A clear answer was given to this question.

I would like to pick out one phrase: "in human terms."

In human terms! Let us cast sentimentality aside: A man wants to leave the motherland. Just like that—he wants a change. Well, that's his affair.... But the exit visa for Bella Gulko and Vladimir Kislik is being delayed for security reasons. Sergey Petrov, Pyatros Pakenas, and Vladislav Kostin were well-informed about state secrets. And they are the people on whose behalf certain American congressmen are persistently petitioning—let them go, period! How can you explain to them "in human terms as a man"... They don't want to understand.

Back in the early seventies, I published a report from the USSR MVD Visas and Registration Department. At that time the would-be emigres were on fire with impatience, their heads were full of fog. I remember how restrainedly and patiently the Visas Department workers talked with them, explaining, advising. Much water has flowed under the bridge since then. Many people have left. I am sincerely sorry for some of them: They were good specialists, not bad comrades. And they pursued their cases secretly, evidently embarrassed, as if ashamed of themselves. I inquired into how life turned out for them. It varied: Some are prospering, more are poor. Many have come back.

One of those who haunted the steps of the Soviet Embassy asking to return was treated in human terms. He was allowed to return to the Soviet Union. I will not mention his name. I will call him P. Then, 15 years ago, at the USSR MVD Visas and Registration Department, I went up to him and said: "How could you... Leave the motherland... After all, it's... And then you'll ask to come back."

"You can spit in my face if that happens," P. replied then. In February of this year many of the "has-beens" returned. P. came too. They were met at Sheremetyevo—without flowers, it is true. But there were more than enough cameras and film cameras. One of the journalists went up to P. I was standing near, and I heard him tell my colleague: "Understand me in human terms. The States isn't Russia. They have a different way of life, you're alone there.... There are no birch trees there.... The sky is different...."

I could not restrain myself, I approached him. P. recognized me. He suddenly broke off, raised the collar of his jacket, and turned away.

After that, we met several times. Of course, we did not exchange greetings. Seeing me, he invariably bows his head and goes away. He has become a Soviet citizen again, and now they call him Comrade P. I would like to believe that what should happen, has happened to that man. But it took him nearly 15 years. How are we to understand that? In human terms?

Economic

Operation of State Enterprise Law Explained

PM301705 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 27 Nov 87 p 1

[Interview with V. Chepurenko, chief of the USSR Gosplan subdivision for improving the management of national economic sectors, by own correspondent A. Vorobyev: "The Yardstick Will Be Profit"; date and place of interview not given, first paragraph is SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA introduction]

[Text] The USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) is coming into force 1 January 1988. Our correspondent, A. Vorobyev, met V. Chepurenko, chief of the USSR Gosplan subdivision for improving the management of national economic sectors, and asked him to answer a number of questions which are worrying our readers.

[Vorobyev] Viktor Leonidovich, the main demand made on managers under the old system of management was the fulfillment of the state plan. Now plans will be drawn up locally rather than at ministries. Will this not result in a reduction of output volumes?

[Chepurenko] The entire new economic mechanism system is geared to a sharp increase in output volumes rather than a reduction. The economic interests of the manager, the production collective, and every worker will now constitute the main moving force of production

development. Enterprises are being freed from the strictures imposed by all kinds of instructions, prescriptions, and regulations. Initiative is given free reign. Enterprises are entitled to adopt any decision which does not contravene existing legislation.

It is as if the state had told labor collectives: "The satisfaction of your interests is in your own hands. Organize highly effective production, make more profit, and dispose of it as you see fit." The part of the profit which remains after the contributions to the budget have been deducted, of course. Profit will be the common indicator of enterprises' economic performance. In turn, high profits cannot be obtained without a maximum increase in production volumes and efficient management.

[Vorobyev] However, if obtaining the biggest possible profit becomes one of the main aims of management, is there not a danger that enterprise leaders may "wave goodbye" to cheap, unprofitable, but very necessary goods?

[Chepurenko] I hope this will not happen. Enterprises will have a vested interest in attracting all the orders they can get and to fully use their potential. We will witness a new phenomenon in our economy—competition between producers who produce the same type of goods. And delivery contracts, in combination with the greatly increased sanctions for failure to meet deliveries, will constitute a good system for monitoring the fulfillment of the output schedule plan. Thus the responsiblity for producing goods that consumers need is not decreasing but, on the contrary, increasing manyfold.

You may say: But how will we find clients quickly—after all, there are no commercial travelers in our country acting as middlemen. So far there are none, but there will be. Gossnab organs, both at the center and at the local level, will act as the commercial travelers, as it were.

Territorial management organs, too, can act as clients. For instance, if mixers or meat grinders are needed in the oblast, the local soviet can conclude a contract with the relevant enterprise via its trade administration or trade department.

[Vorobyev] What question can there be of competition between producers when most enterprises in our country have the monopoly on the production of specific types of goods?

[Chepurenko] The law states that enterprises have the right, provided they fulfill contract commitments, to develop any other activity to ensure a high level of profitability. This means that they can look for additional clients. The interests of several producers may be focused on one and the same client. There is your "basis" for competition.

The law makes it incumbent on state organs to limit enterprises' monopolistic standing. What, specifically, can the state do? It can, if there is a shortage of certain goods, build a number of new enterprises; it can exercise its right to curb prices; it can issue a new state order; it can change the tax on a given article; and it can introduce advantageous credit rates for the development of the production of goods which are in short supply. These factors will make it possible to eliminate enterprises' monopoly.

Naturally, laws cannot foresee everything. You remember the saying about the "dryness" of theory and the ever green tree of life? Life and practice will suggest the necessary changes.

[Vorobyev] In the absence of economic competition between enterprises producing the same type of goods, there is clearly a great danger of an arbitrary inflation of prices by the selfsame "monopolists?" Don't you think?

[Chepurenko] This danger exists. But in general, prices for any article can only be raised to a certain level. If this level is exceeded even by a small amount, the result is a sharp drop in demand. Just remember the review of prices for carpets and cut glass.

It must not be forgotten that even in the new conditions of management the state reserves for itself the right to fix prices for end products. The wholesale prices which are determined by the state will also influence the cost of other goods. For instance, the price of bread is bound to have an effect on the price of combine harvesters. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes will simply not buy low-performance, expensive machinery because they could not recoup the cost. Or take the aforementioned mixers and meat grinders. I assume that local trade will only conclude a contract with the enterprise that produces these goods more cheaply while maintaining high quality.

The overall trend in the operation of the new system of management must be toward a systematic lowering of prices.

[Vorobyev] You have touched upon territorial needs, Viktor Leonidovich. However, enterprises' relations with the territorial authorities are multifaceted. They concern not only the supply of goods to the population. I know that plants repair streets, build tram lines, invest their money in the development of essential territorial facilities on the basis of local party and soviet organs' decisions. Can they ignore local needs now that they have been given independence?

[Chepurenko] The nature of the relations between territorial authorities and enterprises must change, of course. The innovation lies in the fact that part of the profit of associations (enterprises) will be paid into the local budget. Soviets will thus build up a solid monetary fund. Its size will be in direct proportion to the size of the

industrial enterprises' profit. Thus it will simply be economically disadvantageous for local authorities to divert workers from their main job. Incidentally, the authorities will be able to pay for the most varied services out of the local budget fund, and orders for this type of service can be placed with any enterprise irrespective of under whose jurisdiction it comes.

I believe, on the other hand, that enterprise directors should not shrink from repairing tram lines, or roads, or supplying similar services. If, because of bad roads, workers are systematically late for work and take hours to get back home after work, it would do no harm—with the agreement of the collective, to allocate people or money for these needs....

Bank President on Approaches to Reform
LD062008 Moscow TASS in English 1919 GMT 6 Dec 87

[Text] Moscow December 6 TASS—In the opinion of the President of the Board of the USSR State Bank Nikolay Garetovskiy, who contributed an article to the newspaper EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in its December 5 issue, restructuring of the Soviet banking system should go in two directions: formation of new specialized banks and a new approach to the credit and monetary policy.

Five specialized banks have already been formed in the country, he recalls. They are functioning in different areas of the national economy. Underlying their economic accounting activity are profits to be formed through payment of the interest rate by enterprises for the credits issued. The loan fund from now on will not be distributed from the centre between ministries, and questions linked with the use of credits will be decided locally, considering economically-substantiated requirements of enterprises.

Credits are to be given in the first place to the enterprises which ensure acceleration of scientific-technological progress. The content of credit agreements will be determined directly by the contracting parties. They will also define mutual obligations, Nikolay Garetovskiy notes.

The important element in activities of banks and enterprises in the new conditions is that they are now legally equal parties which regulate their relations through economic, legal norms, the president of the board of the USSR State Bank believes.

Partnership, however, does not mean subordination of the bank's entire activity to the enterprise. With their limited loan fund, banks will in the first place give preference to smoothly functioning enterprises. They will be privileged through reduction of interest rates. Enterprises with overdue credit payments will be declared insolvent and will have their interest rate increased. If these measures are to no avail, banks of the USSR may submit for consideration of ministries proposals on elimination or reorganization of such enterprises, Nikolay Garetovskiy notes.

Economist Considers Food Price Rises
PM071539 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 2

[Article by Candidate of Economic Sciences A. Shamov, reader at the Department of Management in the USSR Council of Ministers Academy of the National Economy, under the rubric "Discussing the Problem: Goods and Prices": "And If Production Costs Were Reduced?"—first paragraph is IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] When we published the "Round Table" material under the headline "Goods, Prices, Us..." (IZVESTIYA No 323), the editorial office promised to continue the conversation on the improvement of price formation. Today we publish the next item on this problem.

Karl Marx wrote that prices are the loving looks cast by goods at money. But if these looks were to be judged by the prices of some articles and products, these prices are no longer loving looks but proper vampires which devour the object of their love—money. Yes, prices for consumer goods are rising and now, in the conditions of glasnost, this is asserted not only by buyers but also by the press. And without a radical reform of price formation—which was described at the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum as the most important component of the restructuring of economic management—it is clearly impossible to halt price rises and, even more so, to embark on price reductions.

In the solution of this important economic and social task it is very important, at the very beginning, to correctly define the starting positions which in fact could determine the entire fate of the restructuring of the price formation system. Special emphasis ought to be placed on the fact that we are talking about categories of goods-money relations. In actual fact, the social usefulness of any output produced in commodity production can be determined only through exchange, in the market. And this very idea was, to all intents and purposes, ignored for decades on end in our economy, primarily by the price formation organs. This is not simply a matter of prices' reflecting production costs. The main harm done by this mechanism lay in the fact that a producers' monopoly developed in the country, virtually precluding any influence by the market on prices. Goods were priced not in the process of exchange, not by consumers, but by... the commodity producer himself, using the well-known formula of prime cost plus planned profit. The result was a complete and utter economic absurdity: The higher the producer's costs, the greater the value he created. Hence the enormous gap between the growth of physical and value indicators, the poor quality of goods, and the mass of other economic and social disorders.

Of course, full economic accountability [khozraschet], self-financing, and the inclusion of payments for all types of resources in prices are an effective means to combat the expenditure mechanism. Even so, the central idea expressed by the chairman of the State Committee on Prices requires clarification: "Prices will be formed on the basis of a progressive normative base for all types of expenditures. It would be expedient to elaborate and adopt as such the plan normative production costs of the basic consumer qualities of output." It is possible to calculate and plan normative production costs on the basis of all this, but what happens with profit and profitability? In the author's view, they ought to be included in prices "not in proportion with expenditure but in conformity with the consumer qualities of output, its quality, and the efficiency of consumption."

Let us assume that these qualities of output are also capable of being calculated and the magnitude of the price can be determined overall. But will it correspond with the socially necessary expenditure of labor? No, it will not, because the magnitude of socially necessary expenditures cannot be determined in advance, bypassing the market. These expenditures must constantly be influenced by deviations of prices from value and the market conditions of demand and supply. The producer's monopoly and diktat cannot be economically undermined if his output does not reach the market, and if there is no competition between producers to reduce individual costs of production, increase labor productivity at their enterprise, and gain maximum profits on this basis. Without this, any price will be a monopoly price, regardless of who calculates it and how, regardless of who prescribes it. And prices will rise, one way or another, since they now include payments for all resources that are in increasingly short supply year by year, while the mechanism of economic competition between producers, which counters this increase, will be nonexistent.

Of course, now no one idealizes the mechanism of small-scale commodity market regulation, and even less does anyone suggest that it be used in the conditions of socialism. Nevertheless, since socialism means commodity production (and no one seems to deny this now), it is necessary to have planned centralized leadership of price formation through, for example, those very same long-term economic normatives, coupled with market influence on prices. This is precisely the way the question was presented at the CPSU Central Committee June (1987) Plenum, where there was discussion of the need to make skillful use of commodity-money relations "through prices and financial and credit levers and through balanced mastery of the market with due consideration for its laws."

We must not forget Lenin's indication that any monopoly (and not only imperialist monopoly) leads to decay. Meanwhile, the right vested in the USSR State Committee on Prices to determine prices for even 2.2-2.5 million items of output is, however you look at it, a monopoly. As a result of this, the monopoly in price formation will also operate at other levels, where it is presumed that prices for the remaining 20-23 million items of output will be calculated, and there will be no democracy at all in price formation. Democracy in this sphere does not mean delegation of the right to set prices to subordinate price forming organs, but the creation of conditions whereby price is influenced by the consumer of a given product himself through the market.

The problems of the market's influence on prices can hardly be solved by the contract prices which, under the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association), will apply to contracts with consumers for the manufacture of output for production and technical purposes to fulfill one-shot or individual orders. Especially in view of the fact that "state price formation organs determine the procedure for setting contract prices and monitor their implementation" (Article 17, Paragraph 10). Furthermore, contract prices for the means of production are hardly subject to the influence of market demand and supply, since they are set by agreement within a narrow circle of parties. After all, market influence presupposes the sale of goods at prices set by all who wish to purchase those goods.

Now it is difficult to say what percentage of the total number of prices will be represented by contract prices, but it will evidently be a small percentage since contract prices will not be set for items in mass series production. And if the prices for this output are set bypassing the market, consumers will have no practical influence on them, the expenditures mechanism whose effect cannot be overcome by administrative measures will again come into force, and prices will again fail to reflect the socially necessary expenditure of labor. In such an event, it will hardly be possible to speak of a radical reform of price formation or of the use of economic methods of management.

The beginnings of a radical reform of price formation must, in my view, be sought in production. In order to ensure such a combination, it is primarily necessary to overcome the producer's monopoly.

This is relatively easy to achieve if similar output is produced by several enterprises. Here it is necessary to overcome the hardline diktat by the USSR State Committee on Prices system and switch to wholesale trade in the means of production, introducing in this process a price formation mechanism which would capture the market conditions of demand and supply (more will be said about this mechanism later).

Matters are more complex when all, or the overwhelming proportion, of the output of a given type is manufactured by just one enterprise. Here there can be several options for overcoming the producer's monopoly. In some cases it will mean breaking such enterprises into smaller units and creating parallel production structures, in others—creating a new enterprise, and in yet others—importing a

certain type of output. The use of any one of these options will depend on the specific type of output, the extent to which the national economy's needs for this output are satisfied, and the international market conditions. There is one fundamentally important point: to create an economic situation whereby the consumer can exercise his choice while the producer is forced to fight for custom.

The creation of such a situation will make it possible to speak of a fundamentally new price formation mechanism.

The essence of such a mechanism lies in the fact that the price set for a given type of output is made up of two elements. The first element is the base, the plan normative price set fully in conformity with the principles mentioned by the chairman of the State Committee on Prices. The base price must be structured so as to ensure the enterprise's profitability and the making of necessary payments into the state and other budgets.

The second element is the supplementary price, set by the producer himself with due consideration for market conditions and the quality of his output.

These two price elements form the market price, which ensures greater profits for producers who have low labor costs and high quality of goods. Any income earned from the supplementary price must remain at the enterprise's disposal and provide its collective with an incentive for further reduction of prime costs and enhancement of output quality.

Initially, the introduction of such a price formation mechanism could lead to higher wholesale and later retail prices. But this is the inevitable effect of the "starting dash." The subsequent inevitable effect of the new mechanism will be that high revenues from a particular output will encourage other enterprises to start manufacturing it. Supply will increase while demand for this output will fall, resulting in falling wholesale and retail prices—such is the law of the market.

The advantage of such a mechanism lies in the fact that, through the base price, it ensures the priority of state regulation of the economy while, through the supplementary price, it makes it possible to overcome the producer's diktat on the consumer and to impart the necessary flexibility to prices, influencing the economic interests of both producers and consumers.

At the same time, the necessary conditions will be created to eliminate shortages in the national economy. The opportunity to buy the required output in the market, especially if it has to be bought at high prices, will radically change the consumer's attitude: He will not be buying for future use, and anything he does buy will be thriftily consumed.

And how about retail prices?

Whenever a retail price increase was announced during the period of stagnation, the people involved always managed to find some plausible explanation for it, and these explanations often sounded like mockery in disguise. For example, prices of gold articles, cars, and crystal were inflated, and we were assured that these were not essential goods. Carpet prices were put up, and our consolation was: Prices for synthetic products and other such things have been reduced in exchange. It has to be said that at times prices did go up without any notification to the population at all.

Now we are discussing the question of raising the prices of mass consumer goods, and primarily of foodstuffs. Why has this become necessary?

Over a fairly long period of time (about 25 years) the prices of basic foodstuffs (and we are now talking only about them) like meat, milk, butter, and some others remained basically unchanged while, through the effect of stagnation processes, the production costs of these products were constantly rising. Consequently, the state was buying agricultural products at high purchasing prices and selling at low retail prices. The state budget subsidies to bridge this gap ran into tens of billions—somewhere in the order of R60 billion a year. Back in 1966 the total subsidy for agrarian products amounted to R4 billion, but 20 years later the subsidy for meat and milk sales alone amounted to R57 billion.

What is to be done? One of the possible ways to solve the task of maintaining consumption levels is to redirect subsidies from production to consumption in the form of supplements to pensions, student grants, and parents' own wages and child allowances.

But consumers would be perfectly entitled to ask: What is the difference between the total subsidy for the production of agricultural output being paid directly through the state budget or indirectly through the pockets of a given proportion of the population?

In my view, when examining the problems of price formation for mass consumer goods, and especially of foodstuffs, it is necessary to proceed from the premise that increasing the prices of these goods is not the main avenue for solving the problem in question. Moreover, it is necessary to bear in mind not only the economic but also the social, psychological, and political aspects of the problem in question. Yes, the state could compensate the population to the necessary extent and raise the prices of foodstuffs. But will this solution not raise other imbalances and other acute issues?

Now one can already hear around every corner talk about the impending food price rise. Should it occur, people will quickly forget any compensation payments but will always remember the increased prices, since they will be coming across them every day.

This is why the main avenue for solving the problem is not to hike retail prices to the level of wholesale prices but to bring the latter closer to retail prices by reducing all costs on the production, storage, transportation, processing, and sale of agrarian products.

What are the main paths for solving this task? The decisive factor here is to increase the output of agrarian products as much as possible and expand their availability on the market. The production of arable and livestock products not just an economic but also a profoundly social matter: It is linked with the people's history, with their traditions, culture, family structure, and so on. The essentially forcible elimination of private stockraising and farming plots conducted in the early sixties was a really gross mistake, whose fruits we are still reaping. And one of the main avenues for solving the food problem lies through the restoration of these farms. The stepped up work done along this avenue in the last few years must produce results and must bring purchasing and market prices closer to state retail prices.

The central avenue for bringing purchasing prices closer to retail prices is via the reduction of production costs, the introduction of advanced technologies and the whole range of modern machines, and so on. In addition, the production costs of agrarian output could be appreciably reduced by waging a decisive and effective struggle against the enormous expenditures which are absolutely fruitless and, in many cases, inflict unprecedented damage on agriculture.

Proposed Farm, Food Price Changes to Aid Output

PM031155 Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 2 Dec 87 p 2

[Interview with Doctor of Economic Sciences V. Pavlov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Prices, by TASS Correspondent R. Akhmetov, for SELSKAYA ZHIZN under the "Topical Interview" rubric: "Toward a New Price Mechanism"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Moscow—When buying, say, potatoes in the store at 10 kopeks a kilo, the housewife is unaware that the state is selling them to her at a loss. That is true not only of potatoes. Beef costs the state R5.37 a kilo, whereas the population buys it at an average of R1.77. Mutton costs the state R4.79 a kilo, whereas it retails at R1.50. A kilo of butter costs the state R8.41 to produce but we buy it in the store at R3.38.

"The present price system needs to be radically reformed," said Dr Econ Sciences V. Pavlov, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Prices. "It has acquired many artificial layers, contradictions, and distortions, which prevent agriculture from developing on a healthy economic basis.

"Pork, milk, vegetables, and certain types of hulled crops and bakery products are also being sold at prices which are considerably at variance with their cost and with socially necessary production costs."

[Akhmetov] Perhaps the state compensates for these costs from the profit gained from the sale of equipment to farms?

[Pavlov] That is not so. The state has fixed two price levels for industrial output supplied to agriculture. Let us take the "Belarus" MTZ-80 tractor. The wholesale price to industry is R4,580. That is how much the plant or construction trust which has decided to buy a tractor for its own needs has to pay. But the state sells the "Belarus" to agriculture at R3,987. Here is another example. The cost price of a "Don-1500" combine is R38,000, but it is sold to kolkhozes and sovkhozes at R12,500.

Agriculture buys electricity at preferential rates which are unprofitable to power industry workers. There are preferential prices in operation for natural gas, mineral fertilizers, and mixed feed. Water for farm irrigation is supplied free.

The state has to compensate for the losses itself. And they are immense. Next year, for instance, it is planned to allocate R73.4 billion in state subsidy from the budget to make up for the difference between the state's costs and the retail prices for agricultural produce and also to ensure supplies of equipment and mineral fertilizers on preferential terms. So that you can picture the scale of these costs, I would point out that in 1988, R33.9 billion is to be spent on housing construction from all sources of finance.

[Akhmetov] How did the price distortion occur?

[Pavlov] Under the old method of managing the agrarian sector, the plan for the procurement of agricultural output determined the quantity of potatoes, meat, grain, and other produce that each farm was to sell to the state and, thus, how much it was to produce. Often it was even dictated what was to be sown and harvested and when and where. At the same time, of course, kolkhozes and sovkhozes had to cover all the costs and achieve a profit for development in actual conditions which are far from perfect. Furthermore, the demand for food dictated the expansion of sowing areas in conditions which were by no means the best. The intensification of production costs money. You cannot go on taking from nature endlessly without putting anything back into it. There is only one result possible—depletion. Hence, a whole system of supports was created in the form of subsidies and preferential prices. And the more food production expanded, the more the subsidies that were required.

It is through the use of subsidies in past decades that food prices in the stores have generally remained stable even though purchase prices for agricultural produce have risen by 4.6 times, with a 5.6-fold increase for

livestock produce. Furthermore, industry's new, higher wholesale prices for agricultural machinery and mineral fertilizers, established in 1967 and 1982, were not extended to the agrarian sector. Thus the prices for these products set over 20 years ago largely remained in force. That, in general outline, is how the price distortion originated.

[Akhmetov] How will the new purchase prices be formed?

[Pavlov] The USSR State Committee for Prices, together with interested departments, is now working on a radical restructuring of the purchase price system. We worked on the assumption that when revising wholesale prices, rates for services, and purchase prices in agriculture, there should be no unrecovered costs.

What changes are there in store for the agrarian sector? One of the main problems facing our farms is that because prices for industrial output are low material and technical resources are used wastefully. After all, easy come, easy go, as they say. That is why it is planned to eliminate the two price levels for industrial output supplied to agriculture. Mineral fertilizers, tractors, cars, agricultural vehicles and excavators, and other equipment will be sold to kolkhozes and sovkhozes at their real cost. And they will pay for electricity, heat, and natural gas at the single rate established for industrial and agricultural enterprises.

Farms will have to pay for water used for irrigation. This will create the conditions to ensure the rational consumption of moisture and to increase the effectiveness of the resources spent by the state on land reclamation. In 1985 alone it allocated R1.3 billion from the budget for the upkeep and operation of irrigation systems.

Finally, the level of purchase prices will be determined on the basis of the average socially necessary costs for the production of output and preferential incentives for the production of the basic types of output in the most favorable specialized commodity production regions as well as the prospects for reducing output prime costs based on the introduction of intensive techniques and progressive labor organization. At the same time, the high costs connected with a low standard of farm management must also be borne in mind.

[Akhmetov] Who sets purchase prices?

[Pavlov] The USSR Council of Ministers sets prices for the most important agricultural products and union republic councils of ministers set them for a number of other, non-basic products. In the future it is deemed expedient to apply contract prices to those products which are produced and in the main consumed locally and to link them directly to retail prices in local stores. This will reduce the list of named articles whose purchase prices are fixed by union republic councils of ministers.

The contract system of prices is to be applied on a wide scale, particularly in the development of economic ties between kolkhozes and sovkhozes and industrial and construction enterprises as well as agrocombines, agrofirms, and agricultural enterprises. The latter instance concerns the joint introduction of intensive techniques in crop farming and stock raising, the supply to farms of high quality seeds, pedigree livestock, and feed, and the processing of agricultural produce.

[Akhmetov] Will the price reform not mean a loss for kolkhozes and sovkhozes? Farm leaders have their fears.

[Pavlov] Those leaders who have become accustomed to living off budget subsidies, various benefits, and deferred bank loans and cannot conceive of any other kind of life should be afraid. The experience of many years has shown that the subsidy system reduces farms' interest in making full and efficient use of all resources, increasing labor productivity, and reducing output prime cost.

In passing, I should like to note that the use of purchase price supplements has failed to prevent farms from making a loss. Around one-fourth of kolkhozes and sovkhozes have a very modest level of profitability—around 10%—and a further 13% are loss-making.

However, those farms which manage thriftily and make skillful use of land and equipment have achieved success. In 1986, more than 10% of kolkhozes and sovkhozes had a profitability of 40% or more. They account for more than one-third of the income achieved by all profit-making farms. Some 20% of kolkhozes and sovkhozes also have a good level of profitability—between 25 and 40%.

I am convinced that the restructuring of the purchase price system, together with other measures, will create the conditions for the successful work of kolkhozes and sovkhozes on the principles of full economic accountability. In conjunction with the transfer to wholesale trade in industrial goods, this will increase immensely the demands on the quality of the equipment, mixed feed, fertilizers, and other means of production acquired by farms. In the new conditions kolkhozes and sovkhozes will buy only those goods which are really efficient and in quantities which they actually need.

The new economic mechanism offers broad scope for economic methods of management. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes have been given greater rights and independence in decision-making and the use of profits. In the conditions of economic accountability [khozraschet], labor remuneration will be directly dependent on farm incomes. This will compel them to be more active in introducing the achievements of scientific and technical progress and advanced forms of organizing agricultural production.

[Akhmetov] When will the new purchase prices go into effect?

[Pavlov] They are due to be introduced on 1 January 1991, in some cases even earlier, that is, together with the transfer to full economic accountability [khozraschet]. It must be emphasized here that the radical restructuring of purchase prices, like the reform of wholesale and retail prices, is not a means of improving the country's financial state at the working people's expense. The improvement of prices must be regarded as one of the most important measures designed to strengthen the economy of the agrarian sector, resolve the food problem and, thus, increase the Soviet people's prosperity and raise their living standard.

Moscow Cooperatives To Have Guiding Council

PM021309 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 28 Nov 87 Second Edition p 4

[P. Timofeyev interview with Yu. Luzhkov, first deputy chairman of the Moscow Gorispolkom and chairman of the Moscow Commission for Cooperative and Individual Labor Activity under the "Competent Interlocutor" rubric: "Who Will Control the Cooperatives?"; date and place of interview not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] The union commission on improving management, planning, and the economic mechanism has approved the Moscow Soviet's proposals and permitted it by way of an experiment to start setting up in the capital cooperatives not provided for by previous government documents. We asked Yu. Luzhkov, first deputy chairman of Moscow Gorispolkom and chairman of the city Commission for Cooperative and Individual Labor Activity, to comment on this decision.

[Timofeyev] First of all, Yuriy Mikhaylovich, does this decision mean that all prohibitions have been removed in Moscow and that it is permitted to set up cooperatives of any kind?

[Luzhkov] The new system will enable us to register associations which do not fit into any of the spheres fixed by resolutions. To begin with, more "intellectual labor" cooperatives making use of special knowledge are to appear. Under what heading, for example, could you previously list an association of translators or programmers or a cooperative puppet theater? Ultimately, everything was held up by the question of taxation. In the spring it was important to simplify the entry of the cooperative system into the state system. We think that the time has now arrived when it is necessary to approach taxation in a differentiated manner. There is a proposal to take no money at all from cooperatives which provide the city with services in short supply, such as kindergartens and care of the elderly.... We are prepared even to repair their premises using local funds. But on the other hand, it is necessary to increase taxes on those who have especially high incomes.

[Timofeyev] Under the new conditions the question of financial control over cooperative activity will arise especially acutely....

[Luzhkov] Indisputably. Like any other living system, it is not free from minuses: To be blunt, swindlers as well as honest people are entering the new movement. The "Sozidaniye" cooperative was supposed to be providing transportation services under contract. Instead, the cooperative's leaders recruited more than 600 people with private automobiles under a labor agreement who, having received a certificate from the cooperative, then freely engaged in "haulage" but did not pay the R580 for the license as demanded by law, instead paying only R30. Or take the case which we investigated recently in the city commission. The quality of the dishes sharply deteriorated at the "Kavkazskaya Kukhnya" cooperative and the cooperative workers began to trade in spirits and engaged in drinking bouts themselves. I want to note that approximately 200 cooperative chairmen attended our commission. They unanimously supported our proposal to close "Kavkazskaya Kukhnya."

[Timofeyev] What role does the money received from cooperatives through taxes play in the city treasury?

[Luzhkov] None. The city finances cannot be adjusted by using this money, because it represents only one-tenth of a percent of the budget. We have 355 operational cooperatives. Another 300 will soon be starting work. A drop in the ocean in a city like Moscow. According to our calculations, in order for the role of this type of service to be appreciable, Moscow would need approximately 15,000 cooperatives. Then we would be able to talk in earnest about the role to be played in the city budget by the taxes raised from cooperative workers.

[Timofeyev] People are saying that a public council of Moscow's cooperative workers will be created in the capital. What sort of organization is this?

[Luzhkov] The idea has already been practically implemented. The draft provision for a Moscow Cooperators' Council charter is being elaborated. With the help of the Moscow newspapers, we are planning to bring together all cooperative chairmen at the end of November for an organizational session. They can then elect a council leader and membership so that they can resolve their own problems themselves, coordinate cooperatives' work, and disband or combine them where necessary.

Economic Seminar on Change to New Conditions

PM071359 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Dec 87 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Training of Ministry and Department Leaders"]

[Text] A 5-day seminar has been held at the USSR Council of Ministers' Academy of the National Economy institute to improve the skills of leaders of the top level

of state management, involving leaders of union ministries, enterprises, and associations which are transferring to the new conditions of economic management on 1 January 1988.

During the studies there was an examination of questions of the theory and practice of shaping an integrated management system, organizational and economic problems of the transfer of enterprises (associations) to full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing, the improvement of planning, material and technical provision, labor remuneration and incentives, price formation, the finance and credit system, statistics, and the management of scientific and technical progress.

The seminar program paid special attention to practical questions involved in implementing the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) and the exchange of experience among ministries working in conditions of full economic accountability [khozraschet] and self-financing. The seminar participants exchanged experience in preparation for the transfer of enterprises, associations, and organizations to the new economic management conditions.

Students were addressed by V.P. Mozhin, first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Economic Department; A.I. Milyukov, leader of a group of consultants of the CPSU Central Committee Economic Department; S.A. Sitaryan, first deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan; I.I. Gladkiy, V.S. Pavlov, and M.S. Shkabardnya, ministers and chairmen of USSR state committees; N.G. Belov, B.Ye. Kurakin, V.K. Senchagov, and B.M. Yakovlev, deputy chiefs of departments; V.V. Simakov, chief of a department of the USSR Gosplan; A.S. Samsonov, general director of the "Pervyy Moskovskiy Chasovoy Zavod" Association; and professors of the academy.

Major Environmental Violations Uncovered

PM080925 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Nov 87 Morning Edition p 6

[Unattributed report: "At the USSR Prosecutor's Office"]

[Text] The general supervisory checks carried out by prosecutor's office organs with the participation of specialists from the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control and the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources in the power engineering and ferrous and nonferrous metallurgy systems have established blatant violations of environmental protection legislation and nonfulfillment of plan targets for the improvement of the ecological situation.

Associations and enterprises in the above sectors have failed to fulfill the plan targets for reducing discharges of harmful substances and pollutants into the air and the water and for commissioning nature conservation projects, and have not taken the necessary measures to ensure the normal working of purification installations.

In the last 5-year plan ferrous metallurgy enterprises only half fulfilled the target for reducing discharges of untreated effluent. Discharges of pollutants into the atmosphere remain high. They determine the condition of the air over a number of cities. The content of pollutants in the atmosphere over these cities considerably exceeds permissible concentrations. The plan for the commissioning of nature conservation measures in the last 5-year plan was not fulfilled, and in 1986 the position over the commissioning of these installations deteriorated. Ineffective use is made in the sector of purification installations. More than one-third of all investigated installations were found to be technically defective or were working very inefficiently.

A serious situation with environmental pollution has emerged at nonferrous metallurgy enterprises. Enterprises in this sector are discharging large amounts of polluted or simply untreated effluent.

Discharges of pollutants into the atmosphere remain high. Yet the funds allocated for nature conservation measures are not being assimilated. Many economic leaders in this system have not reacted to instructions from supervisory organs pertaining to the eradication of violations of the laws on nature conservation. Despite the prevailing situation, the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification, the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, and the USSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy have failed to implement real measures to carry out the nature conservancy laws, and have failed to make the proper demands on the leaders of enterprises which are worsening the ecological situation.

A particularly unsatisfactory situation has arisen with regard to the execution of the aforesaid legislation at industrial enterprises in the Armenian, Georgian, and Kazakh union republics.

In resolving the problems of developing sectors, priority continues to be given to narrow departmental interests rather than to protecting nature and the population's health.

The unsatisfactory work to protect the environment has been promoted—as specialist checks carried out in the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control system established—by the state committee's low demandingness and by these organs' ineffective and inadequate implementation of state control of the sources of environmental pollution and observance of the norms for the maximum permissible level of discharge. The USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control failed to carry out checks at sector headquarters, and failed to heed reports by their leaders or by the leaders of associations, enterprises, and organizations at their sessions.

The USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control Collegium, examining the questions of environmental protection, failed to profoundly work through the key tasks that arose, did not show the proper principledness in pursuing the state line on the use of nature, and failed to take the necessary measures to ensure fulfillment by economic leaders of the representations and instructions issued to them by supervisory organs. One-third of the resolutions issued on suspending, restricting, or curtailing the use of installations polluting the environment have not been fulfilled.

The leaders of the committee and its subunits have failed to make use of the rights granted to them for reacting directly to violations of the law by suspending, restricting, or curtailing the use of installations, shops, and enterprises, and demanding that ministries and departments remove guilty officials from their jobs or institute disciplinary or other proceedings against them for having violated nature conservation laws.

Many cases of air pollution go unexamined by administrative commissions. This practice is widespread in the Ukrainian, Armenian, Azerbaijan, and Kazakh union republics, the Bashkir Autonomous Republic, Krasnoyarsk and Maritime Krays, and Moscow Oblast.

The economic damage done to the national economy by pollution of nature and the irrational use of natural resources runs into many billions of rubles. This enormous damage is rarely made good, while that done by air pollution is never made good.

State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control organs have failed to define the extent of the pollution damage done to the atmosphere, have not taken measures to make good the damage, and have not altered their methods for calculating the scale of damage—methods which they consider unsophisticated.

The USSR Prosecutor's Office Collegium, with the participation of the leaders of the aforesaid ministries, examined the results of the checks and demanded that ministry leaders take additional measures to implement the nature conservation laws and step up the responsibility of and the demands made on the managers of enterprises and organizations. The USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology and Environmental Control has issued a resolution to eradicate the violations that have been revealed.

Information about this question was examined at a USSR Council of Ministers Presidium session on environmental protection and the rational use of natural resources.

Most often it was at the initiative of prosecutors that the guilty parties had disciplinary, administrative, or material penalties imposed on them or were warned about the impermissibility of breaking the law. The number of officials and the sums recovered from them for damage to the environment have increased. Criminal proceedings have been initiated on the basis of cases of criminal violations of the law. The examination of the criminal case of the pollution of Lake Ladoga by the Priozersk Pulp and Paper Plant has been completed. Brega, former plant director, Pyarevskiy, former chief engineer, and Zhuravlev, former shop chief, have been sentenced. Criminal proceedings are being looked into on the basis of a number of other cases of blatant violations of the law.

All prosecutors have been instructed to step up their supervision of the enactment of nature conservation legislation and to make full use of the available powers for eradicating violations and making good the damage done. Prosecutors in 30 cities and rayons have been instructed to carry out the necessary measures in order to ensure that the discharge of untreated effluent and the release of pollutants into the atmosphere over and above permissible normatives at the enterprises under supervision be ended within 1-2 years.

The USSR Prosecutor's Office, together with other interested ministries and departments, is studying the question of whether or not the existing environmental protection legislation matches modern demands and the need to step up the responsibility of those guilty of violating it.

Scientific

Gorbachev Signs Obituary of Scientist Zeldovich

PM071713 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Dec 87 Second Edition p 3

[Obituary of Academician Yakov Borisovich Zeldovich]

[Excerpts] Soviet science has suffered a grievous loss. Academician Yakov Borisovich Zeldovich, eminent Soviet scientist, major physicist, three times hero of socialist labor, and chief of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Physical Problems' Theoretical Department, died suddenly 2 December 1987. [passage omitted]

M.S. Gorbachev, V.I. Vorotnikov, A.A. Gromyko, L.N. Zaykov, Ye.K. Ligachev, V.P. Nikonov, N.I. Ryzhkov, N.N. Slyunkov, M.S. Solomentsev, V.M. Chebrikov, E.A. Shevardnadze, V.V. Shcherbitskiy, A.N. Yakovlev, P.N. Demichev, V.I. Dolgikh, Yu.F. Solovyev, N.V. Talyzin, D.T. Yazov, A.P. Biryukova, A.F. Dobrynin, A.I. Lukyanov, V.A. Medvedev, G.P. Razumovskiy, I.V. Kapitonov, G.I. Marchuk, Yu.D. Maslyukov, B.L. Tolstykh, V.A. Grigoryev, L.D. Ryabev, V.A. Kotelnikov, Ye.P. Velikhov, V.I. Ilichev, V.A. Koptyug, A.A. Logunov, G.A. Mesyats, Yu.A. Ovchinnikov, P.N. Fedoseyev, K.V. Frolov, A.L. Yanshin, G.K. Skryabin, N.N. Bogolyubov, M.A. Markov, A.M. Prokhorov, A.P. Aleksandrov, N.G. Basov, A.S. Borovik-Romanov, A.V. Gaponov-Grekhov, V.I. Goldanskiy, A.D. Sakharov, I.M. Khalatnikov, Yu.B. Khariton.

Correction to Cosmos-1899 Satellite Launch

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Launch of 'Cosmos-1899' Satellite Announced," published in the 7 December Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 76: column one, paragraph eight, only line: ...Minimum distance (perigee)—216 kilometers, [new paragraph] Inclination—70.4..." (changing "126" to "216")

Briefs

'Microbioprom-87' Closes

Moscow December 3 TASS—The international exhibition of microbiological processes and equipment—"Microbioprom-87" (microbiological industry), which closed here today, aroused considerable interest among Soviet experts. Over the eight days while it was open, the exhibition was visited by nearly 30,000 microbiologists and medics from numerous Soviet research centres. On the stands and at the lectures within the framework of the scientific technical symposium they could, in particular, familiarize themselves with the trends in the development of biotechnology, which has been ever more broadly applied recently in pharmaceutics, agriculture and the food industry.

As a TASS correspondent was told at the commercial centre, the Soviet Foreign Trade Organizations and foreign participants in the exhibition actively took part in export-import deals worth a total of more than two million roubles. A part of the contracts, including for the purchases of exhibits, has already been signed, while talks on the others, including supplies in a more distant future, will be continued. "Microbioprom-87", which was held with the participation of almost 150 firms, organizations and plants in 17 countries was sponsored, as was the case at two previous exhibitions on the same subject matter, on the initiative of the Soviet Ministry of Medical and Microbiological Industry. [Excerpts] [*Moscow TASS in English 1750 GMT 3 Dec 87 LD*]

Antarctic Expedition Supplied

The "De Vitus Bering" has left Leningrad for the Antarctic carrying MI-8 helicopters, and IL-14 aircraft, and other cargo for the Soviet expedition. [Summary] [*Moscow International Service in Russian 0715 GMT 5 Dec 87 LD*]

Military

'Military Bulletin' Numbers Missiles

LD041715 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 4 Dec 87

[Text] The latest number of the NOVOSTI Press Agency's MILITARY BULLETIN [VOYENNIY VESTNIK] came out today. For the first time, the journal publishes information on the number of Soviet medium-range missiles as of January, 1987. There are now in service in our country 355 such missiles, based underground [seychas no vooruzheniyi nashey strany imeyumsya 355 takikh raket podzemnogo bazirovaniya]. These include 112 SS-4 missiles and 243 SS-20's. At the same time, in the service of the Soviet Army in the European part of the country, there are 18 sea-based missiles [na vooruzheniyi sovetskoy armiyi v europeyskoy chastri strany imeyutsya 18 raket morskogo bazirovaniya]. Here the Soviet Union has 507 medium-range bombers. The NOVOSTI press agency's MILITARY BULLETIN gives information on the ratio of naval forces between the countries of the Warsaw Treaty and those of NATO.

Lizichev Addresses Session on Komsomol Work

PM071223 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 6 Dec 87 Second Edition p 1

[Own correspondent report: "To Enhance Komsomol Militancy"]

[Text] A conference of assistant chiefs of political directorates of branches of the armed forces, districts, groups of forces, and fleets for Komsomol work has been held at the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

The conference participants were addressed by Army General A.D. Lizichev, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate.

There was a businesslike and exacting discussion of the course of restructuring in Komsomol organizations and of the fulfillment of the 27th party congress and 20th Komsomol Congress decisions. Specific ways were outlined to further enhance the Komsomol's militancy and activeness and to increase its contribution to the struggle for combat readiness, stronger discipline and regulation order, and the cohesion of multinational military collectives.

Admiral A.I. Sorokin, first deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, participated in the conference's work.

Kurkotkin Speaks at Bagramyan Memorial Soiree

PM041235 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 4 Dec 87 Second Edition p 4

[Unattributed report: "To the Commander's Memory"]

[Text] A soiree devoted to the 90th anniversary of the birth of Marshal of the Soviet Union I.KH. Bagramyan was held in the Red Banner Hall of the M.V. Frunze Central House of the Soviet Army in Moscow on 2 December.

The soiree, which was attended by servicemen of the capital's garrison, veterans of the Great Patriotic War, and relatives and friends of I.Kh. Bagramyan, was chaired by Army General I.G. Pavlovskiy.

Marshal of the Soviet Union S.K. Kurkotkin, USSR deputy defense minister and chief of the Armed Forces Rear Services, delivered a report on the life and activity of the Soviet commander.

Army Generals N.G. Lyashchenko and I.I. Gusakovskiy, Colonel General I.D. Isayenko, and Lieutenant General V.A. Matsulenko shared their memories of twice Hero of the Soviet Union Ivan Khristoforovich Bagramyan, Communist serviceman and ardent patriot and internationalist.

Lushev Addresses Army Sports Specialists

PM011051 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 29 Nov 87 First Edition p 6

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel V. Zhitnikov: "Enhancing Physical Tempering"]

[Text] A training and methodological rally of Soviet Army and Navy physical training and sports specialists has ended. Summing up its results, Army General P. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister, dwelled in particular on the fact that the rally jointly elaborated avenues for further improving the standard of the personnel's physical training—an important element of combat readiness—and for attainment of high results in sport by Army and Navy athletes. Proceeding from the demands of the USSR defense minister, it is essential to achieve a decisive breakthrough in this work. It is necessary that not only should shortcomings and reasons for stagnation phenomena be revealed in the branches of the Armed Forces and in the districts and fleets but also that specific culprits be named and that measures be outlined to improve the state of physical training in the units and on ships.

Speaking of the tasks for the new training year, Gen Lushev particularly stressed that it is essential to most resolutely improve the standard of physical training of officers and ensigns and their methodological skills. Special attention must be paid to training of military school and academy students and training of reconnaissance subunits.

All this work must be performed in full accordance with demands of the MANUAL ON PHYSICAL TRAINING IN THE SOVIET ARMY AND NAVY (the NFP-87).

During the 4 days of the rally, its participants heard interesting lectures, reports, and speeches, took a direct part in practical exercises in gymnastics, hand-to-hand fighting, overcoming obstacle courses, and swimming, and exchanged work experience.

Kazakov on Need to Revamp MVD Image

OW080523 [Editorial Report] The Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2300 GMT on 6 December carries the scheduled " I Serve the Soviet Union" program, presented by Boris Kazakov. One of the items deals with the inferiority complex felt by soldiers of the MVD, and the poor image the MVD enjoys among the population. The items begins with file film showing infantry charging through fire and Private Vadim Shulshi saying: "We carry the same weapons and use the same bullets. We experience the same combat conditions. I feel so tense about all this that I am having trouble expressing myself. We are on duty for 24 hours, then we are off for a full day. And this is what happens. While on leave we go into town. We would like to meet a girl, but as soon as they see our insignia, they turn away from us. Comrades, this breaks our hearts. We are the same soldiers as those in the infantry, Air Force, or Navy."

As the video shows file film of soldiers charging through fire, the voice of Kazakov is heard saying: "For your information, the MVD troops are part of the USSR Armed Forces. They are intended for use in guarding government projects, as well as other military duties."

Video shows an interview with Lieutenant Colonel V.G. Yevlampiyev, saying that, although there are many articles written about the role and duties of MVD troops, these are carried only by their own newspaper, and therefore only read by the MVD troops themselves. On the other hand, the major youth newspaper, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, which is read by millions, completely ignores the MVD.

Sergeant Andrey Viktorov says that the media concentrates entirely on the other services and completely ignores the role and conditions within the MVD.

Vadim Shulshi says that there has been a general impression among the uninformed,that the MVD are "secret forces" and that therefore it would be undesirable to write about or film.

Video then shows Boris Kazakov in studio reading one of the letters written by an MVD veteran complaining that little has been shown about the MVD on this program, and the public knows little about them and is not well disposed towards them. Kazakov says:"Indeed, the young men serving in the MVD are the same as those serving in the infantry, marines, or the border guards. But, unfortunately, a negative stereotype was allowed to form about them. Perhaps because there was so little information for such a long time, and this allowed rumors to permeate public thinking. Speaking for myself, I recall thinking, when the question of making a film about the MVD first arose: 'what is there to film? guarding prisoners, or manning watch towers.' Then I realized that, in reality, they are safeguarding us all." Kazakov ends the item by saying that the parents of soldiers serving in the MVD forces have the same reason to be proud as any other parent of a serviceman.